REPORT RESUMES

ED 003 011 24

FUNCTIONS OF STUDENT TEACHING, ATTITUDE FORMATION, AND INITIATION IN ELEMENTARY STUDENT TEACHING.
BY- IANNACCONE, LAURENCE BUTTON, H. WARREN
WASHINGTON UNIV., ST.LOUIS, MO.,GRAD.INST.OF EDUC.
REPORT NUMBER CRP-1026 PUB DATE JUL 64
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.18 HC-$5.00 125P.

DESCRIPTORS- *STUDENT TEACHING, *PROGRAM EVALUATION, *ELEMENTARY EDUCATION, SELF CONCEPT, ANXIETY, ATTITUDES, COMMUNICATION (THOUGHT TRANSFER), CHANGING ATTITUDES, TEACHER EDUCATION, ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

STUDENT TEACHING WAS EXAMINED TO DESCRIBE THE PART THIS EXPERIENCE PLAYS IN MAKING A TEACHER. THREE HYPOTHESES WERE TESTED--(1) FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF THE EXPERIENCED TEACHER SUBCULTURE, STUDENT TEACHING HAS THE FUNCTION OF TRANSMITTING THE NORMS OF THAT SUBCULTURE TO THE STUDENT TEACHER, (2) FROM THE STANDPOINT OF THE STUDENT TEACHER, THE EXPERIENCE PROVIDED TEACHER NORMS AND REDUCED ANXIETY CONCERNING TEACHING, AND (3) FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF THE STUDENT TEACHER, STUDENT TEACHING CHANGED HIS SELF-IMAGE FROM THAT OF COLLEGE STUDENT TO TEACHER. FEMALE, ELEMENTARY STUDENT TEACHERS WERE SUBJECTED TO FOUR TESTING INSTRUMENTS AT THE BEGINNING, DURING, AND AT THE END OF THEIR STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE. INTERVIEWS, ALSO, WERE CONDUCTED, AND DAILY DIARIES WERE ANALYZED. DATA DID NOT SUPPORT THE FIRST HYPOTHESIS, BUT INDICATED THAT STUDENT TEACHING SEEMS TO REDUCE ANXIETY RELATED TO BEING EVALUATED. STUDENT TEACHING ALSO APPEARED TO ENHANCE THE STUDENT TEACHER'S SELF-IMAGE AS A TEACHER. ANALYSIS OF DAILY DIARIES REFLECTED THE RELATIONSHIP OF ACTUAL STUDENT TEACHING PERFORMANCE TO PERSONAL ANXIETIES AND SELF-IMAGES. (WB)

ED003011

REFERENCE
COPY
COOPERATIVE
RESEARCH
PROGRAM
No. 1026

1026

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

FUNCTIONS OF STUDENT TEACHING

ATTITUDE FORMATION AND INITIATION IN ELEMENTARY STUDENT TEACHING

LAURENCE IANNACCONE
AND
H. WARREN BUTTON

JULY 1964

PREPARED AT WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, ST. LOUIS, UNDER COOPERATIVE
RESEARCH PROJECT, NO. 1026, OF THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION,
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE.

FUNCTIONS OF STUDENT TEACHING

Attitude Formation and Initiation in Elementary Student Teaching

Laurence Iannaccone
Claremont Graduate School
Claremont, California

and

H. Warren Button
State University of New York at Buffalo
Buffalo, New York

Prepared at Washington University, St. Louis, under Cooperative Research Project, No. 1026, of the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

July, 1964

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The United States Office of Education's Cooperative Research Program, jointly with Washington University, funded the research project reported here. The authors are deeply indebted to our colleagues of the Graduate Institute of Education whose shared norms of dedication to the scholarly study of education supported us throughout this project. We owe a special debt for his encouragement of our venture to Robert J. Schaefer, the architect of the Graduate Institute of Education.

Four persons helped us with this investigation in the capacity of research assistants, Mr. Wayne Bridgeman, Mr. Eugene Jabker, Dr. Frank Lutz and Dr. Ralph Schmid.

The final report was completed with the help of the Mesdames Pauline Border, Vera Costain, Faye Iannaccone and Carol Pauk.

We are grateful to the more than one-hundred anonymous student teachers from Lindenwood College, St. Charles, Missouri, McKendree College, Lebanon, Illinois, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, and Washington University, for their cooperation as subjects in our study, and to their respective institutions. They, and the sample of more than one-hundred experienced teachers from the Ferguson-Florissant, Missouri, and Alton, Illinois, School Districts, in the final analysis, made the study possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

1. Background and Purpose 1

Terms Commonly Used With Respect to Student Teaching 1

Historical Overview of Student Teaching 3

Manifest Purposes of Student Teaching 6

2. Exploring Three Possible Latent Functions of Student Teaching 12

The Teacher Subculture and Conformity to It 12
The teacher-pupil relationship
The subculture's norms

Hypotheses and Predictions 16
The source of the sample studied
The instruments

The First Hypothesis 19
Findings

The Second Hypothesis 25

The Third Hypothesis 27

Conclusion 28

3. Concepts to Analyze the Logs of Student Teachers 30

Three Conceptual Frameworks 31
Interaction sets
Perspective

Separation 35
Separation continues in student teaching

CHAPTER PAGE

4. The Dyad: Social Structure of Transition 41
  Alice: Social Distance and Influence 42
  Betty: Beating the Clock 44
  Carol: Simplifying the Lessons 49
    Decreasing the amount to be learned
    Tighter control of pupil behavior
  Donna: Coercion Works 53
  Ellen: "It Works" 57

5. The Teaching Set: Social Structure of Incorporation 60
  Faye: Developing the New Perspective 61
    Time and schedule
    The universe of learning and the planned lessons
    The children and classroom control
    The redefined problematic situation
  The Deviants 73
    The new perspective from the beginning
    The old perspective to the end
  Discussion of the Findings 80

TABLES

I. Means and Tests of significant differences between experienced and inexperienced teachers 23

II. Means and Tests of significant differences of students before and after completion of student teaching 24

III. Means and Tests of Washington University Population TIA(E) and TIA Anxiety Scores 26

TABLES

PAGE

IV. Means and Test of Total Population TIA Anxiety Scores 27

V. Means and Tests of Washington University Population TIA(E) and TIA Identification Scores 28

VI. Means and Test of Total Population TIA Identification Scores 28

APPENDICES

I. (Form Q) 84

II. (Form TIA) 91

III. (Form O) 93

IV. (Form TAT) 95

V. Description of Measures 97

VI. Correlates of MTAI Validation Instrument 112

VII. Alice's Balance Sheet 115

BIBLIOGRAPHY 117

Chapter 1

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

It seems apropos to state at the outset what our purpose has been in conducting this study. Put simply, our first aim is to describe the part student teaching plays in making a teacher. The study is primarily exploratory and descriptive rather than verificational in nature. Its findings are most usefully seen as producing hypotheses rather than conclusions. The number of student teachers that we watched, interviewed, and tested was small, although to us and our assistants it sometimes seemed intolerably large. We were concerned only with the general changes, the general results of student teaching, as they appeared in our subjects. The individual variations--products of differences in situation or personality, or both--have largely gone unconsidered.

Terms Commonly Used with Respect to Student Teaching

To avoid ambiguity, we shall define here the terms we are using to describe student teaching:

> Student teacher: a student who, in the process of preparing to teach, spends part or all of her time for a semester or quarter in an elementary classroom observing and teaching under the guidance of an experienced teacher. "Intern teacher," "practice teacher," and "apprentice teacher" have been used in referring to students in such programs. The student teachers we are describing are females who intend to teach in the elementary schools.
>
> Cooperating teacher: an experienced classroom teacher under whose guidance and in whose classroom the student teaching takes place.
>
> Pupil: the child, or adolescent, in that classroom.
>
> Supervisor: the teacher education institution faculty member who supervises the student teacher's work. He may also be known as "college co-ordinator" or "college supervisor."

Teacher education institution: the college, teachers' college or university which undertakes to educate teachers.

Cooperating school: the public elementary school in which the student teaching occurs.

Laboratory school: a cooperating school which is part of a teacher training institution. (Occasionally a laboratory school which is part of both the community public school system and the teacher training institution may be found.)

To describe student teaching generally, it is necessary to use general terms. The student teacher is most often a college senior in her last or next to last semester of college work. She may earn as many as twelve or as few as two semester hours of credit for her student teaching. She may teach in a laboratory school on her college campus, in a school in the metropolitan area surrounding her college, or in a small town as much as a hundred miles from her college campus. She may spend as little time as one hour daily or as much as the entire day in the classrooms of the cooperating school. Generally, student teaching lasts a semester or quarter, although it is occasionally spread out over a longer period. Typically, the student teacher observes and aids the cooperating teacher and for varying periods of time teaches the class herself. The amount of teaching our subjects did ranged from as little as ten clock hours to as many as two hundred. The reader who is interested in further details will find information in the 1956 Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching, which contains four lengthy accounts of typical student teaching activities.[1]

Generally, student teaching is the culminating course in a sequence of eight to thirty-six semester hours in education. The number of hours spent in education courses is dependent upon the certification requirements of the state involved and varies somewhat depending upon whether the student is aiming toward work in the elementary or the high school. Frequently, the elementary certificate calls for more credits in education courses than does the high school certificate. The sequence of courses which is completed by the student teacher ordinarily includes an introductory course in education and courses in educational psychology; school organization and management; methods courses (both general and specialized) such as the principles of teaching, the teaching of reading, the teaching of music, etc., and a course in the history of education.

Today, student teaching is, almost without exception, a part of teacher education curriculum. In 1959 it was specifically required for regular certification--that is, for recognition as a teacher who has completed formal professional training--in forty-seven states, and was a part of the approved curriculum in a forty-eighth. Only Maine and Montana did not require student teaching. The most frequent requirement, for both elementary and high school certificates, was six semester hours. (Certification Requirement, National Education Association, 1959 edition.)

---

[1] Margaret L. Carroll, Dorothy M. McGeoch, and Carl W. Proehl, editors, "Four Went to Teach", 1956 Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching, (Lock Haven: State Teachers College, 1956), 9-124.

Historical Overview of Student Teaching

The history of student teaching in the United States may shed light on this institution. To one searching for evidence of origins and early influences, the tradesmen's apprentice system suggests itself, and actually, it is a matter of record that for a time some teachers in England and Holland did serve an apprenticeship. However, the English apprentice system appeared slightly later in time than the development of practice teaching in American normal schools, and thus exerted no observable influence. The Dutch system, although earlier in time, does not seem to have caught the attention of American educators.

Three historical influences have been suggested as contributing to establishing the practice of student teaching in the United States. These are the German and French systems of teacher training and the Lancastrian schools in England. Carter, Hall, Mann, and other influential educators of the time were men familiar with the German normal schools, and student teaching had made its appearance in the United States some years before 1830, when it was officially instituted in France. In the Lancastrian system the older students taught the younger; the similarity to practice teaching is apparent. Prospective teachers did work under supervision in Lancastrian schools in Philadelphia shortly after 1818,[1] in England by 1835,[2] and in New York City in the 1840's,[3] but the practice proved to be unsatisfactory and was abandoned. In 1823 the first "teacher seminary," a privately financed school for teacher training, was opened in Concord, Vermont, by Hall. It had a "model school," the forerunner of the laboratory school. This school was short lived and Hall moved on to establish a Teachers' Seminary, as a part of Phillip's Academy at Andover, Massachusetts; it also had a "model school."[4]

---

[1] M.A. Newell, "Contributions to the History of Normal Schools in the United States", United States Commissioner of Education, Annual Report, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1900), II, 2447.

[2] Lance G.E. Jones, The Training of Teachers in England and Wales, (London: Oxford University Press, 1924), 13-14.

[3] Edward S. Mooney, An Analysis of the Supervision of Student Teachers, Teachers College, Columbia University, Contributions to Education No. 711, (New York: Teachers College, Columbia, 1937), 1.

[4] Henry Barnard, Normal Schools and Other Institutions, Agencies, and Means Designed for the Professional Education of Teachers, (Hartford: Hartford, Case, Tiffany, 1851; Reprinted, Greeley: Colorado State Teachers College, 1929), I, 113.

The education of teachers, then, as advocated and practiced, included practice teaching before 1830. The most important institution for teacher education in the nineteenth century was the normal school which appeared in Massachusetts in 1839 and 1840. The first normal schools at Lexington and Bridgewater had model schools.[1] Public acceptance of the normal school, however, was slow in coming, and in 1861, twenty-two years after the first normal school opened in the United States, there were only twelve in operation.[2] The schools spread slowly from Massachusetts into the old Northwest, the Middle Atlantic states, and the rest of New England.

Even when a normal school was established and able to survive, there was difficulty in maintaining and operating a model school. The history of the model school at what is now the Northeast Missouri State Teachers' College at Kirksville is a case in point.

The normal school was started in the building of the Cumberland Academy, which had been privately financed and was affiliated with a conference of the Presbyterian Church. The Acodemy, which had opened in 1860, was a victim of the Civil War in 1861, and a second school which attempted to hold classes in the building was dispersed by a nearby battle in 1862. For five years, then, the building was used only occasionally, for such events as church services and public entertainments. In 1867, however, Professor Joseph Baldwin, an experienced normal school principal, established at Kirksville, in the old Cumberland Academy building, a normal academy, which was then, except for the St. Louis City Normal School, the only normal school in Missouri. The undertaking was a financial success. After a loss of $315 the first year, the school showed a profit of $1,185 the second, and by the end of 1870 had become a publicly supported normal school. President Baldwin had also organized a model school, which was staffed by the normal school faculty and served as a preparatory department for the normal school. Normal school students may have observed there but did not teach. Even so, there was considerable public opposition to the model school, and it was closed in 1873. When it reopened, in 1882, in the basement of the Normal School building, it was used for student teaching.

The Kirksville Normal School planned in 1905 to set up a new model school which would be just what the name implies--an ideal one-room rural school, a model to show students and people of the state "...what can be done...for not over a thousand dollars." According to Violette, by the end of 1905, the model school or training school and the normal school itself were on solid ground.[3]

---

[1] William S. Learned, and others, The Professional Preparation of Teachers for American Public Schools, (New York: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1920), 28-29.

[2] Willard S. Elsbree, The American Teacher, (New York: American Book Company, 1939), 152. See also E.M. Violette, History of the First District State Normal School, Kirksville, Missouri, (Kirksville: Journal Printing Company, 1905).

[3] Violette, op. cit.

In terms of the number of teacher education institutions, the data for the period around the turn of the century are impressive. In 1898, there were 167 state-supported normal schools in the country, compared with the 11 that had existed in 1860. There were even more private normal schools.[1] By 1890 there were already 114 private colleges which had teachers' courses.[2] But this may be misleading on two counts: First, the normal schools were academically still at the level of the high school, accepting grade school graduates as students. In 1903 Kirksville would credit the student with ten of the eighteen hours required for graduation if he had completed high school. In many cases normal school students were graduated after abbreviated courses of study.

Second, in spite of the large number of institutions, the number of graduates was small. In 1898 there were 11,000 graduates from teacher training institutions of some sort while, according to Elsbree, there were some 50,000 new teachers that year.[3] A survey in 1910 indicated that two-thirds of those then teaching had no formal education beyond what would be high school level, and that there were at least as many teachers (about eight per cent) without formal education beyond eighth grade as there were with four years of college.[4]

In 1920 a survey showed that in Missouri there were still almost as many teachers without formal education beyond eighth grade as there were with four years of college, that 28% of the state's teachers had less than four years of formal training and that another 28% had between four and five years of training after grade school.[5] Many of these last, of course, had had academic training in high school, rather than training in "pedagogies."

By 1909, according to the same survey, almost all normal schools required student teaching, and by then, "methods" courses and student teaching were generally parts of the junior and senior courses of study. The methods courses were taken just before or during the term in which student teaching was accomplished. Half the normal schools responding to the survey questionnaire required a full year of student teaching; another third required two quarters. Four-fifths of the normal schools responding had "model schools"--the author (Lewis) used that term. The others relied on what we have called cooperating schools. (The cooperating school had made its appearance much earlier. There is a record of one as early as 1844.)[6]

---

[1] Newell, op. cit., pp. 2464-2468.

[2] Elsbree, op. cit.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Lotus Delta Coffman, The Social Composition of the Teaching Population, Teachers College, Columbia University, Contributions to Education, No. 41 (New York: Teachers College, Columbia, 1911), 31.

[5] Learned, and others, op. cit., pp. 361-369.

[6] Newell, op. cit., p. 2275.

By 1910 teacher education programs had appeared in private colleges and land grant universities. A few laboratory schools were in evidence, but there were sometimes long delays in establishing them. The University of Michigan, which had had a teacher education program since 1875, did not acquire a laboratory school until 1920, after two decades of bitter debate.

By 1920, four years of formal education beyond high school was often the standard for teacher preparation, including, as had teacher preparation programs from the beginning, student teaching. The increase in the number of laboratory schools, however, was less rapid than the increase in the number of student teachers; a series of surveys from 1920 to 1948 shows a continuing tendency to rely increasingly upon cooperating schools for student teaching facilities.[1]

Historically, then, the practice of student teaching has been a part of specialized teacher education in the United States from the beginning. Specialized teacher education has been generally accepted since about 1900, and has been conducted at the college level since around 1920. As in the past, most students preparing to teach undergo the student teaching experience in a regular public school classroom with a cooperating teacher rather than in a model or laboratory school.

Manifest Purposes of Student Teaching

Although we tend to think in terms of latent function,[2] rather than purpose, of student teaching, we are interested in the variety of statements of purpose which we have noted. There are several hypotheses which one might make in advance: Any statement of purpose of student teaching would be compatible with statements of purpose of teacher education. Both of these must be in accord with what is believed to be the nature of the teacher's task. One would suppose that a statement of purpose of student teaching would use the terminology of the time.

The relationship between purpose of teacher education and the nature of the teaching task holds well enough. Consider, first, the similarity between a statement as to the purpose of a normal school taken from an address at the opening of the Lexington normal school in 1839, and Mann's parallel statements a year later on the desirable qualifications for teachers, taken from his report of 1840.

---

[1] Esther J. Swensen, Robert C. Hammock, "Off Campus Laboratory Experiences: Their Growth, Importance, and Present Role", 1951 Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching, (Lock Haven: State Teachers College, 1951), 20-21.

[2] Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1949), 21-81.

Purpose of normal school[1]	Teacher qualifications[2]
1. Instruction, especially in the common branches.	1. A knowledge of common school studies.
2. The art of teaching.	2. "The next principal qualification in a teacher is the art of teaching."
3. The science of school government, and theory applied to practice in the model school.	3. Management of government and discipline of a school.

The similarity is obvious, and the underlying conceptualization of teaching is clear. First, the teacher teaches subjects, the common branches, and therefore must be well acquainted with them. Second, the teacher must possess, in addition, the art of imparting them--an art involving an "intuitive" knowledge of the order in which the material is to be presented and of the pupils' problems in learning. Third, and apart from the first two, the teacher must know how to "manage, govern and discipline" a class--or a one room school. It is this final knowledge which is to be gained through student teaching. Here, then, is compatability among purpose of student teaching, purpose of teacher education and qualifications for teaching. The near identity of the language and concepts used in describing student teaching and its purposes is obvious.

In Washington, D.C. in March of 1889, the Department of Superintendence--predecessor of the American Association of School Administrators--devoted a session to the discussion of teacher training. The statements of two of the speakers on the aims of teacher training and the purpose of student teaching are interesting because of their inter-relationships and because of the language and concepts employed. First, there is an emphasis on the logical and the analytical as something to be learned and, for the prospective teacher, to be taught:[3]

> It is of the first importance that teachers do intelligent work at every point of educational effort and that, in turn, they secure work on the part of the pupils that is intelligent. Such work is attractive and, if directed aright is always profitable.

---

[1] Newell, op. cit., p. 2267.

[2] Horace Mann, The Republic and the School, edited by L. Cremin, (New York: Teachers College, Columbia, 1957), 45-48.

[3] William B. Powell, Training Schools, N.E.A. Department of Superintendence, United States Office of Education, Circular of Information 1889, No. 2, Proceedings, 1889, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1889), 52.

Then a statement of desirable learning on the part of the prospective teacher:[1]

> Not only does the young teacher learn by this analysis of the subject the logical arrangement of the parts thereof, but he learns also the psychological sequence of the parts; not only does he learn the place of each part, but he learns the relative importance of each part of the study . . . .

The concept and emphasis have changed since Mann; the emphasis on "intelligence" and "analysis" is almost certainly Hegelian, as interpreted by William T. Harris, and the language is commonplace in education of the 1880's and 1890's.

Another speech made the same day offered a description of the nature of "means" in formal education generally:[2]

> The principal means in school education of whatever kind is the free action of the pupil's powers. Everything else is subordinate to this. It is the agency at the center of the process. Results flow directly from it . . . .

Powell had spoken of the outcome of student teaching in the same way:[3]

> The pupil-teacher...does not prepare for his future use a book full of sample lessons, but he acquires the ability and strength to analyze a unit of work, to arrange the parts in proper order to be taught, and to know the values of the parts, and acquires an original way of developing them, which is good, because it has been developed by trial and proved by criticism, but its chief merit is that it is his own.

The Hegelian motif reappears in Powell's formulation, but there is an implied concern for the unique qualities of pupil and student teacher, a formulation which in 1889 was less common than a decade or two before, but still commonplace in the formulations employed by educators. Probably it shows the influence of Pestalozzi and Froebel, as transmitted by Francis Parker. It is, in any event, similar to what was being written during the period concerning teaching and supervisory methods in general.

---

[1] Powell, op. cit., p. 56.

[2] S.S. Parr, The Purpose and Means of City Training Schools, N.E.A. Department of Superintendence, United States Office of Education, Circular of Information 1889, No. 2, Proceedings 1889, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1889), 65.

[3] Powell, op. cit., p. 59.

By 1917, one article on student teaching had already picked up the terminology of "scientific management" in education, and a writer spoke of "The absence of any discernible standard...the lack of any uniform scheme... handicapped by the lack of 'norms'...sharply defined norms and criteria..." "May it not be possible," the article concluded, "on the basis of expert investigation and experimentation, some day to formulate one duly accredited BEST method of preparing the student for the noble calling of the teacher?"[1] This is a direct paraphrase of Bobbitt's NSSE yearbook of 1913--even the capitalization follows it.

In 1926, the activity unit, from general teaching methods, was the subject of a Columbia Teachers' College dissertation; a list of twenty-one units was presented, in order of difficulty from "I. Cleanliness and Neatness of the Room" to "XXI. Securing a Position and Holding It".[2]

The anti-theoretical set of the 1920's was also apparent:[3]

> In writing this course, what to omit has troubled the author more than what to include. He has attempted to forget all educational theory and going back into his experiences, first as a teacher and then as one who engages and directs teachers, to select the phases of school work which are most necessary for the inexperienced teacher to know. He has tried to incorporate the tricks of the trade that he picked up after much floundering and at great expense to the children entrusted to his care. If teachers can begin their work with a certain amount of 'stock in trade'...

Reminiscent of the 1920's check lists for ratings, there was a "program for observation," from "seating" to "extra-curricular activities."[4] These deal primarily with method of training. They do, however, clearly show the use of concepts common to their day, and Walk and Stewart, at least, also imply purposes of training, "tricks of the trade," and the "BEST" method of teaching. If there were "stock in trade," and if that were the chief characteristic of good teaching, then it would follow that teaching is a trade, that the problems of thinking are not susceptible of intellectual analysis, at least not by the teacher. The teacher would be a journeyman, as a carpenter is a journeyman. The search for "BEST" which came from Frederick Taylor's management theories, is surely a search for uniform procedures, for standardization, and as its critics in the 1930's pointed out, an argument which would reduce or eliminate teachers' initiative.

---

[1] George E. Walk, "Practice Teaching and Observation in Normal Schools", Education, XXXVIII (1917), 84-85.

[2] Hugh Clark Pryor, Graded Units in Student Teaching, Teachers College, Columbia University, Contributions to Education, No. 202, (New York: Teachers College, Columbia, 1926), 103.

[3] Hugh Stewart, "A Practical Course in Teacher-Training for a Liberal Arts College", Educational Administration and Supervision, VI, (1920), 367.

[4] Stella Bradfield, "Observation, Participation, and Practice Teaching for Liberal Arts College", Educational Administration and Supervision, VIII, (1922), 105-112.

Later, in the 1930's and 1940's, there are statements of purposes put in psychological terms:[1]

A. The development of some measure of skill by student teachers in certain fundamental methods, procedures and techniques used in the teaching and learning process.

B. The development of a greater degree of mastery of subject matter content and of educational principles and implications involved. . .

C. The development of desirable professional interests, attitudes and ideals. . .

D. The development of desirable personal characteristics and of desirable relationships with others.

Perhaps Thorndike's influence shows in "skill" and "mastery." "Interests, attitudes, and ideals" probably come out of psychology after Thorndike.

In the 1950's, there were statements of purpose and as in the language (or clichés) of the social philosophy of the period. As he defines "teacher competence" Michaelis lists:[2]

Have clear purposes
Study the pupils
Meet children's needs
Know the community
Make effective plans
Make content meaningful
Use group processes
Use varied materials
Evaluate outcomes
Maintain professional relationships

In a current book,[3] the purposes of student teaching are discussed and defined in terms of "social interaction, interacts with pupils..., continuous contacts..." and a melange of terms from earlier periods, "instructional leadership...continuous contacts...understanding of the teacher situation...continuity of experience...professional competence... growth process..."

---

[1] Charles W. Boardman and William S. Carlson, Student Teaching Handbook, (Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Company, 1950), 1-2.

[2] John U. Michaelis and Paul R. Grim, Student Teaching in the Elementary School, (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1953), 2-9.

[3] Aleyne Clayton Haines, Guiding the Student Teaching Process in Elementary Education, (Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1960), 9-10.

The development of student teaching and its general acceptance as a part of teacher training or education, on the one hand, and the varying statements of purpose on the other, are a paradox: everyone agrees as to the necessity of student teaching; everyone disagrees as to why.

We have had student teaching for more than a century and a quarter. It appeared with the beginning of formal teacher education. It spread from the normal school to the colleges and universities. It is required by certification authorities almost everywhere. It is looked upon as the most important of experiences in teacher education. A thriving educational association (The Association for Student Teaching) devotes its efforts to the improvement of student teaching. There is consensus that student teaching is valuable; this has been a common opinion since the beginning of professional education--all without agreement as to why.

This leads us to a general hypothesis that student teaching persists either because of its manifest or latent functions. If the manifest function is not clearly defined in statements of purpose--and it is not--then the latent function is worth trying to describe. One purpose, according to Merton, of the distinction between manifest and latent functions is to help interpret "social practices which persist even though their manifest purpose is clearly not achieved."[1] The balance of this report is concerned with a number of explorations we undertook in an attempt to understand the latent functions and consequences of student teaching.

---

[1] Merton, op. cit., p. 64.

Chapter 2

EXPLORING THREE POSSIBLE LATENT FUNCTIONS OF STUDENT TEACHING

As Merton has pointed out, "proceeding from the functional view.... we should ordinarily (not invariably) expect persistent social patterns and social structure to perform positive functions which are at the time not adequately fulfilled by other existing patterns and structures."[1] In this connection we adopted an approach which seemed to us particularly relevant in relation to student teaching. We saw student teaching as an initiation, a rite de passage, a process of induction into a teacher culture or subculture. It was therefore necessary to attempt to describe what we thought of as the subculture of teachers.

The Teacher Subculture and Conformity to It

The first hypothesis we entertained concerning the nature of that subculture was that teachers could be seen as forming a profession, in the sociological sense. The "ideal type" used to identify a profession,[2] however, requires that its members possess knowledge of appropriate "pure" sciences and be skilled as well in their application. The "ideal" professional will be responsible to the professional code of ethics and responsible for the future welfare of his client. We concurred that it would be a laudable state if the teacher were a professional; we concluded, with Lieberman,[3] that he is not primarily that. Put another way, the hypothesis was not applicable.

The alternative which we selected was to employ the "ideal type" of the classical bureaucracy. In order to be so classified, it is necessary that an organization have a given purpose, that its operation be subject to rational control, and that its members be career employees whose path of advancement is upward within the bureaucracy. This concept seemed to be more applicable to teaching, and indeed, its employment here is not an innovation in education research; it has often been used in discussion and investigation of school administration. The term, as it is used here, is not intended to be disparaging. As has been pointed out time and again, in the large organizations of our time, with specialization of work (and related knowledge and skills), there seems no alternative to bureaucracy as it is defined in these terms. The commonplace derogation of bureaucracy should be, from our point of view, a commentary not on bureaucracy in general, but upon malfunctioning bureaucracy.

---

[1] Merton, op. cit., p. 71.

[2] A.M. Carr-Saunders, P.A. Wilson, The Professions, (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1933).

[3] M.K. Lieberman, Education as a Profession, (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1956).

The formal organization, in order to function effectively, must provide means by which the superordinate may control. Such control is necessary for co-ordination of work, and implies a need for predictable response on the part of the subordinate, for without predictable response, control is lacking.[1] Presumably, predictable response in turn calls for personnel with certain sorts of characteristics. We could not say at this point to what degree the development of such personnel is achieved by the process of training and to what degree it is the function of selection and retention. Assuming that it was in part due to training, the corollary question which occurred to us was: Why should an individual conform to the demands of a bureaucracy? The usual statement, of course, is that the activities of an individual tend to result in meeting his psychological needs. This seems cogent generally, but somewhat dubious in a situation in which the individual's behavior is predicated by the purpose of the organization, rather than by his needs. To this question Presthus[2] provides one tentative answer. The individual in the bureaucracy, Presthus argues, does not directly satisfy needs by his activities within the bureaucracy. His activities are, so to speak, only instrumentalities, in that they provide the means, economically and in terms of status, to satisfy psychological needs at other times and places. If this be so, then the individual's behavior within the organization can be accounted for by the notion of anxiety reduction. He does what he does not because his activities are in themselves rewarding, but because his performance of them alleviates the possibility that the means to rewarding activities will be curtailed. This is not intended to say that he acts consciously and rationally to further his own interests; his behavior may be motivated instead by his anxiety, or fear, and his ability to verbalize or rationalize his anxiety may be--by implication, is--irrelevant.

The Teacher-Pupil Relationship. Applying to schools the concept of bureaucracy, also raises questions concerning the relationship of teacher to pupil. Is it more useful to view the pupil as part of the bureaucracy or as its client? If the pupil is seen as not being a part of the bureaucracy, then it follows, in terms of the "ideal type" that the relationship between teacher and pupil must be characterized by "affective neutrality." That is, affection toward the outsider must not be a factor which influences the behavior of the bureaucrat, because insofar as this is a factor, it will limit the predictability of his behavior, and thus the control which the bureaucracy could exercise over it. Interestingly, a phenomenon which seems similar appears in

---

[1] Merton, op. cit., p. 154.

[2] Robert Presthus, The Organizational Society, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962), especially pp. 257-286.

Merton's The Student Physician.[1] Lack of identification with patient, and disappearance of emotional involvement with patient may appear on first consideration to run counter to the professional "ideal type." However, the characteristic of the professional "ideal type" is concern for future well-being of client, not liking of the client.

Whether affective neutrality appears as a psychological defense of the physician or as a necessary function for the effective functioning of a bureaucracy, it raises certain questions. If the bureaucrat or professional is to influence the behavior of the client, such influence will be stronger if the professional or bureaucrat is seen by the client as friendly. Most simply, he who is friendly will be seen as friendly. This is an assumption which has been employed quite generally in educational literature, and which specifically provides the basis of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory;[2] concerning this point, a small ancillary study described in Appendix VI, suggests that positive affect toward pupil is one thing, and behavior of teacher which is related to positive affect of pupil toward teacher is another, and that the two may not be closely related. An analogy may be found in the role of the salesman. To influence the prospective customer, he is best seen by the prospective customer as friendly. On the other hand, he is expected to act in the interests of his employer. Perhaps a similar phenomenon is the physician's "bedside manner," which, it may be inferred from The Student Physician, is role acting. Although the role assuredly demands more than displaying apparent positive affect toward the patient, it seems likely that this is one component of the role.

But, if it is presumed that the pupil is most usefully viewed as a part of the school organization, rather than a client or outsider, research and hypotheses from industrial management studies clearly suggest other relationships between teacher and pupil. In a normal course of events, the teacher would then seem to occupy a role analogous to that of the foreman in industry. (We perceive that teacher-pupil planning, though highly commended, is still less frequent in the classroom than are teacher-directed activities.) The foreman must be concerned for both the "effectiveness" and "efficiency" of the worker, "effectiveness" in this context being regarded as accomplishment of task and "efficiency" as satisfaction of the psychological needs of the worker. Research by Stogdill and Coons suggests that it is possible for foremen and supervisors to achieve both, although they are apparently contradictory.[3]

---

[1] William Martin, "Preferences for Types of Patients" in The Student Physician, Merton, Reader, and Kendall (editors), (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957), pp. 189-206.

[2] Walter W. Cook, Carroll H. Leeds, Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory, (New York: Psychological Corporation, 1951.)

[3] Ralph M. Stogdill, Alvin E. Coons, Leadership Behavior: Its Description and Measurement, Research Monograph 88, Bureau of Business Research, (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1957).

There is, at this point, no clear answer at to the question of whether the pupil is or is not most usefully viewed as part of the school subculture. The current arguments of Coleman and others[1] that there is an independent subculture, would imply that the adolescent pupil at least it not a member of the school subculture.

The Subculture's Norms. No organization is wholly formal. Interaction not directly related to the formal organization gives rise to an informal organization, which is perhaps most simply characterized by Homans,[2] whose formulation is that common activities, common sentiments, and interaction are interdependent, each springing from the others. The informal organization typically develops norms, or expectations, as to the behavior of its members. These norms may well work against the purposes of the formal organization, as seen in Homans' description of the "bank wiring room," in which there were definite expectations as to the amount of work done by each individual each day.[3] These norms effectively limited work, in spite of the incentive system set up by mamagement.

Considering the relationship of the formal and informal components of any organization, it is possible that the norms of the latter act against the purposes of the former, but this is not necessarily so. It may be that the norms of the informal group are unrelated to the purposes of the formal organization. For instance, some of the bank wiring room men played a kind of baseball during their lunch hour. In a school, some faculty members eat lunch at the same time and place each day. Two teachers in adjacent classrooms may by habit talk for a minute or two as they watch classes pass. It may also be that the norms of the informal organization further the purposes of the formal organization. For example, instruction in a classroom--the stated purpose--cannot proceed unless order is maintained. It may be that the taacher is judged by his superordinate in terms of the order kept in the classroom. It may also be that the teacher is judged by his peers in the same terms. If this is the case, the informal norm supports the formal purpose.

It only remained, then, to estimate the probability of norms re-enforcing purpose. Several phenomena made such re-enforcement seem likely. The administrator is not likely to think of or express the purpose of the formal organization of the school in terms of a few abstractions. He, being human, and being concerned with the tactics as well as the strategy of organization, is more likely to deal in immediate rather than long range goals. Almost without exception, the administrator has been for a part of his career a classroom teacher, and presumably retains, at least in part, the attitudes he held as a classroom teacher. Therefore, we would suppose that the purpose of the school, as perceived by the administrator, is modified somewhat in the direction of prevailing teacher norms. Further, if the teacher does, to a degree, identify with the school, then the purposes of the school will be incorporated to a degree in faculty norms. On this basis, there seemed to us to be a probability that norms would re-enforce purpose, as purpose is seen by the administrator, and that both formal and informal organization could be seen as constituting the subculture of "school."

---

[1] James S. Coleman, The Adolescent Society, (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1961), and C.W. Gordon, The Social System of the High School, (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1957).

[2] George C. Homans, The Human Group, (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1950).

[3] Ibid., pp. 48-80.

Hypotheses and Predictions

Seeing the school as a culture, then, we could draw specific hypotheses based on our perception of the culture, predicting in general that the student teaching sample would move toward the experienced teacher if there was a difference initially between the student teacher sample and the experienced teacher sample, and that, if attitudes generally held by teachers were learned in the course of student teaching, the dispersion of scores would be less following student teaching than before it.

Although this seemed the most fruitful procedure, there were rather obvious and not to be underestimated hazards implicit in the assumptions we had made. We had assumed, for the purposes of this portion of the study, that there was such a thing as a general school subculture. Further, we had assumed that the social structure in this subculture had some substantial resemblance to a bureaucracy as the concept is used in the sociological sense. We had assumed, moreover, that the norms of a school into which a student teacher went were similar enough to general teacher norms so that the transmission of the one implied the other. It was also assumed that there were substantial changes of affect during student teaching.

We hypothesized student teaching, from the point of view of the experienced teacher subculture, as having the function of transmitting the norms of that subculture to the student teacher. From the point of view of the student teacher, we saw it as having the function of providing an occasion for acquiring teacher norms and of reducing anxiety concerning teaching. Again, from the student teacher's standpoint, we hypothesized it would function to change his self image from that of college student to teacher. We limited our exploration of these hypotheses to female elementary student teachers.

The Source of the Sample Studied. Our information and data came from testing students who were preparing to be elementary teachers at the beginning, during and at the end of their student teaching experience, as well as from interviewing student teachers and from reading their daily log or diaries. A few of these students we supervised, and a few others we knew as our own students in education courses. The student teachers included in this study came from four mid-Western institutions.

The smallest of the four institutions in terms of its teacher education program is Lindenwood College in St. Charles, Missouri. Lindenwood is a private denominational women's college about an hour's drive via expressway from downtown St. Louis. The campus is at the west edge of St. Charles, and it is being surrounded by suburbs and housing projects as St. Charles is absorbed into the expending metropolitan area of the City of St. Louis.

The first impression of Lindenwood is of a pleasant gentility and air of leisure. When we first visited the campus, we noted that there was carpeting on the floor of the department chairman's office and drapes at the window. The amenities of life seem important to students and faculty. Lindenwood is well endowed for its size. Most of the students come from a wide area and live on campus in dormitories.

Lindenwood's curriculum for teacher education was conducted by two faculty members at the time of this study. One, the department chairman, was a former city superintendent of schools; the other, who was primarily responsible for the preparation of elementary teachers, was formerly an elementary supervisor in one of the larger St. Louis suburbs.

Courses required for certification are determined in Missouri, as in most states, by the State Department of Education. Lindenwood's students who aspire to teaching certificates are required to have an introductory course in education, a course in educational psychology, and several methods courses. Student teaching involves a half-day for one semester in nearby public schools. In the spring of 1961 there were only three elementary school student teachers.

McKendree College, a Methodist co-educational school thirty-five miles east of St. Louis in Lebanon, Illinois, is one of the oldest liberal arts colleges in the state. In many respects it is the antithesis of Lindenwood. McKendree's history seems to have been the story of a century and a quarter's battle against the problems imposed by scanty endowment and limited financial resources. It has been described as being in a state of perpetual financial crisis. There are on campus two or three sternly handsome buildings built in mid-nineteenth century. These dominate the campus which sits on a rise at the edge of Lebanon. More recent buildings are of the quonset hut type. Dormitory facilities at McKendree are only sixty per cent occupied, as most students are from the local area and live off campus. A substantial part of the student body is made up of housewives and other part-time students, some of whom are Air Force personnel from nearby Scott Air Force Base.

Education courses were conducted by one full-time faculty member and a number of school administrators and retired persons from the surrounding area. There were at McKendree eighteen full-time faculty members and about twice that many part-time instructors.

Certification requirements in Illinois are similar to those in Missouri, and the courses in the teacher education sequence are similar. Elementary student teachers are placed in schools in the general area for half-days during one semester. They meet weekly with the Director of Student Teaching, who also observes and evaluates their student teaching.

The third cooperating college was Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, just more than one hundred miles southeast of St. Louis. Southern Illinois University has the largest teacher training program of the four schools involved in the study. Its programs produce more than four hundred teachers each year. The general impression is that the college is in the throes of an almost explosive growth, having a current enrollment of several times that of a few decades ago.

Southern Illinois University has evolved from a normal school at the secondary level near the turn of the century to a burgeoning institution with an enrollment second in the state only to that of the University of Illinois. The early buildings on the campus are surrounded and somewhat overwhelmed by later ones built in the forties and fifties and others under construction at present. There were twenty-five faculty members in the School of Education.

Our sample population consisted of those students who were doing practice teaching during the spring quarter of 1961 in the University laboratory school. During their quarter of student teaching, most Southern Illinois University students return to their home communities to teach there. Those who teach in the laboratory school are, for the most part, those who live in or near Carbondale. We were not informed of the basis for assigning students to the laboratory school or to nearby schools.

The fourth institution is our own college, Washington University. Since we identify with it and know it intimately, it is difficult for us to describe it objectively or briefly. Washington University is at the western city limits of St. Louis. Older suburbs lie north, south, and west of the University. Most of the student teachers were from these suburbs and did their practice teaching in suburban schools. Very few were placed in the St. Louis City Schools.

Washington University is somewhat more than a century old. It could probably have been described until the turn of the century as an obscure liberal arts college. After 1900 it moved to its present campus, and acquired several professional schools. In the 1950's there was considerable effort to upgrade the faculty and student body. The Graduate Institute of Education had a full time faculty of nine of professional rank and several others who taught one or more education courses at the time of our study.

It seems an oversimplification, but it is easy to conclude that Lindenwood and McKendree give the impression that their final commitments are to their students, Southern Illinois' commitment is to growth and to the community and Washington University's commitment is to "scholarship." It is impossible to speculate on the extent to which the differences in college environment, faculty, and commitments are reflected in student values and perspectives.

The experienced teachers from whom we obtained data were also women, and were teaching in five elementary schools of two school districts in the metropolitan St. Louis area. One district, lower middle class suburban, is in Illinois; the other is a middle class suburban district in St. Louis County, Missouri. These data were taken from experienced teachers, from teachers with three or more years experience in elementary school only.

The Instruments. Four instruments were developed or adapted. These were:

1) "Q", (for Questionnaire) a form made up of items to which the subject was to respond on an IBM scoring sheet as strongly disagreeing, disagreeing, undecided, agreeing, strongly agreeing. Items from the several scales and quasi-scales were arranged at random.

2) "TIA", (for Teacher Identification and Anxiety) consisting of two scales; one was intended to measure the student teacher's perception of the manner in which he was viewed by co-operating teacher, other teachers in the school, principal, pupils, the college supervisor, and other student teachers; the other was to be a measure of anxiety felt in student teaching. There was also an additional single item concerning his self-perception.

3) "Form O", an adaptation of Osgood's semantic differential,[1] which measures "connotation," or affect, in terms of: Dimension I, an evaluative factor (good, kind, beautiful, vs. bad, cruel, ugly). Dimension II, potency factor (hard, strong, severe, vs. soft, weak, lenient). Dimension III, oriented activity factor (active, excitable, hot, vs. passive, calm, cold).

4) A modification of the TAT, scored for the patterns of speech and thought which McClelland characterizes as "schema."[2]

Copies of the instruments are included in the report as Appendixes I - IV. Brief explanations as to their nature appear in Appendix V.

The First Hypothesis

Our general thesis, put in the formal form of a rather general hypothesis: if schools in general may be seen as a subculture, and if teaching personnel share the norms of that subculture, and if student teaching has the function of initiating members of that subculture; then during student teaching the affect and perception of student teachers will tend to move toward that of experienced teachers, and will tend to be less widely dispersed.

Parts of the Q, O and the TAT data were utilized in testing predictions which were drawn from this hypothesis. In form Q:

SES (Socio-economic status). That before-scores would be higher than after-scores, and that both would be higher than experienced-teacher-scores, high being middle class, low being lower class. We made this prediction following the observation that concern for immediate satisfaction for the pupil, that is, the gratification of his immediate needs, would appear to be similar to some lower class standards, rather than middle class standards.[1]

---

[1] Charles E. Osgood, George J. Suci, Percy H. Tannenbaum, The Measurement of Meaning, (Champaign, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1957)

[2] D.C. McClelland, J.W. Atkinson, R.A. Clark, E.E. Lowell, The Achievement Motive, (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1953).

CON (Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire Consideration Scale).[2] That "consideration" scores would rise in the course of student teaching, but that after student teaching, scores would still be lower than experienced-teacher scores. This scale has previously been used rather extensively by several investigators. This variant was a measure of perception of appropriate behavior ("A teacher should. . .") as being of such a nature as to display consideration by the leader toward other members of the group. Our thought on teacher manner, or "bedside manner," previously described, influenced this prediction.[3]

IS (Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Initiating Structure Scale).[4] That "initiating structure" scores would rise in the course of student teaching, but that after student teaching, scores would still be lower than experienced teacher scores. This scale has been used previously with CON, and items were in similar "teacher should" form. It was designed as a measure of appropriate behavior to secure the satisfactory completion of task, of structuring so that individuals would be aware of their part of the task, and of how to undertake it.[5]

ANX (Q) (Anxiety Scale, Q Form). That anxiety would fall during student teaching, but that at the end of student teaching it would still be higher than that of experienced teachers. This scale was made up of selected items from the Mandler Anxiety Scale,[6] modified as seemed necessary.[7]

R (Rejection). That "approved practices" as we perceived them taught in teacher education institutions would, when they conflicted with the practical demands of the school-as-bureaucracy, be discarded; before-scores lower than after-scores, with both lower than experienced-teacher-scores.

---

[1] P. 24.

[2] Stogdill and Coons, op. cit.

[3] P. 14.

[4] Stogdill and Coons, op. cit.

[5] P. 14.

[6] G. Mandler, S.B. Sarason, "A Study of Anxiety and Learning," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1952, 47, 166-173.

[7] P. 13.

W (Pupil Welfare). That if the future welfare of the pupil conflicted with the operation of the school, those values concerning the pupil would be sacrificed. That student teaching acted against, rather than for, the professionalization of teacher, as that term has been defined here. That scores would fall during student teaching, but remain higher than experienced-teacher-scores.

TV (Teacher Value). That values for teacher behavior, as contrasted with values placed on behavior generally, as presumably measured by SES, would also tend downward. That before-scores would be higher than after-scores, which would still be higher than experienced-teacher-scores.

P (Concern for Pupil). That concern for pupil, when conflicting with more pressing needs of the school, would be sacrificed. This is similar to the W measure and prediction; the P items, however, dealt generally with social conformity as the stated alternative to future welfare. That before-scores would be higher than after-scores, that experienced-teacher-scores would be lower than either.

X-MTAI (items deleted from the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory). In the construction of the MTAI, investigators discarded several items which correlated with experience of teachers. These items, retrieved, were included in the Q form. It was predicted that after student teaching, scores would be closer than before to experienced-teacher-scores.

Form "O" (Osgood):

Here data was gathered concerning "connotation," or affect, as measured by an application of Osgood's instrument, toward CS (College Student), P (Pupil), S (Self), and PST (Public School Teacher) on each of three dimensions, I like-dislike, II potent-impotent (or as was suggested later, high status-low status), and III, active-passive. Beyond the general predictions of change toward experienced-teacher-scores and convergence, we also predicted that S I scores would fall during student teaching, and that S I scores would rise with the completion of the task of teacher preparation. We also predicted that CS II scores would fall and that PST II scores would rise.

TAT (Thematic Apperception Test):

McClelland-type TAT's with four pictures were a part of the period and paper battery. The test form and the instructions (Appendix II) both specified that the pictures were of pupils and teachers, and that the stories were to concern pupils and teachers. Thought was given to scoring these responses for needs by the McClelland protocols. Pilot data were scored for need achievement ("the need to equal or excel the performance of another or of a fixed standard of excellence") and need affiliation ("the need to be liked or to act in such a manner as to be liked"). Need achievement scores from pilot cases were different at a point approaching significance when summer school pupils and a small sample of experienced teachers were compared--these are not mutually exclusive categories, or course--but scoring of a sampling of test data suggested no differences. This avenue, in any event, seemed somewhat unlikely, in view of several investigators' inability to contrive arousal conditions for need achievement for women; perhaps because of the general culture in which women are not expected to achieve. Need affiliation scoring was done on pilot responses and a sampling of experimental data. Both samples showed an almost complete absence of need affiliation imagery, so no further investigation in this direction was undertaken.[1]

Some thought was given, also, to the possibility of explaining observed anxiety as tension due to an unfilled need. This required postulating a need arousal by a situation in which it was difficult or impossible to predict outcomes. It seemed reasonable to argue that experience would teach an individual that other needs were unlikely to be fulfilled in any situation in which the individual could not predict the outcomes of his or of other's actions, and that therefore he would learn a need to predict. Following this line of logic, a scoring protocol modeled after McClelland's was set up, and a validation experiment was conducted in which the control group was given a TAT "cold," and the experimental group was given a TAT following a period in which it was directed to work on a series of rather difficult riddles. The results of this validation experiment were not at all conclusive (significance, .25 by chi square test). The failure to obtain significant differences may have been due to the small number of subjects, (only about twenty in each group) or to the low reliability of the scoring, (never above .80) even when imagery only was scored, or to the development of a poor construct. We are inclined, of course, to feel that the last of these is not the case. However, in view of the difficulties encountered, this line of investigation was not followed further.

Our choice, finally, was to score the TAT's for what McClelland has called "schemas," ways of looking at, of describing, personality. Four categories were scored for:

J (Jargon), or the use of professional terms, predicting that frequency of usage would increase with student teaching, that before-scores would be lower than after-scores, and that after-scores would in turn be lower than experienced-teacher-scores.

I (Initiation), situations in which the teacher was seen as initiating activity, as opposed logically to situations in which the activity was initiated by the pupil, and differing from stories in which there was no evidence as to who initiated the activity. Our notion of the nature of the school bureaucracy or subculture, of course, influenced this prediction.

AC (Activity), which was scored for when activity, per se, without other outcomes, was seen as the end or result of the story. Since activity is observable outcome, it seemed likely that if the goals of the bureaucracy or values of the subculture were misplaced or shifted, they would shift toward proximate, rather than ultimate, goals, toward observable outcomes. We predicted that before-scores would be lower than after-scores, but that after-scores would still be lower than experienced-teacher-scores.

---

[1] As an aside, however, this was a finding of minor interest. Judging from the responses, all outward appearances notwithstanding, almost no one, neophyte or experienced teacher, apparently found anything in teacher-pupil relationships or situations involving pupil and teacher which aroused need affiliation.

AFF (Affect), scored for when affect, or attitude, was mentioned during the course of the story. If concern was for the immediate satisfaction of the pupil, or for management of pupil behavior, then affective changes would be important. Prediction: that before-scores would be lower than after-scores, that after-scores would be lower than experienced-teacher-scores.

CO (Cognition), scored for when understanding, or steps leading toward understanding, i.e., introduction of a concept, mastery of a concept, etc., was seen as the result or a consequence of the story. By argument which was near to the inverse of that employed for the AC category, we predicted that before-scores would be higher than after-scores, and that after-scores would still be higher than experienced-teacher-scores.

Findings. The success of the predictions made in relation to the first hypothesized function of student teaching as transmitting subcultural norms, can be dealt with rather briefly; in general, they were not borne out. The first general assumption, or prediction, to be tested was that beginning student teacher scores would be significantly different from those of experienced teachers. This was supported in only ten of twenty-five measures:

TABLE I - Means and Tests of significant differences between experienced and inexperienced teachers.

Measure	M, before (N=75)	M, experienced (N=99)	"t"	P
CON	53.12	49.37	4.373	.005
W	74.33	71.80	2.495	.01
CS II	26.87	28.13	1.674	.05
P II	25.27	26.38	1.740	.05
S II	38.71	37.29	1.961	.025
PST II	25.37	26.69	1.662	.05
J	1.25	1.50	1.560	.10
I	1.58	1.80	1.325	.10
AC	2.22	2.65	2.028	.025
CO	0.52	0.35	1.534	.10

Significant differences (p .1 or less) are shown in Table I. To explain the failure of the remainder, there seem to be several alternatives. We might argue, first, that our samples were too small. This may be. There is also the possibility that our samples were not representative; this, as a matter of fact, was surely true; the size and representativeness of the sample were suitable for an exploratory study only. It may also be that lack of significant differences was due to artifact of measurement. Specifically, we considered the possibility that our own measurement instruments may have been ineffective. This indeed may have been the case; one possibility of improving, clarifying their nature and improving their ability to distinguish, is item-by-item factor analysis of some instruments. On the other hand, of the twenty-four measures employed, fourteen were measures previously used and for the most part previously validated; five showed significant differences. Of ten measures not previously used or greatly adapted, five showed significant differences.

The alternative is that the null hypothesis is true (in any event, the parsimonious assumption), and that there were no differences in these respects between beginning student teachers and experienced teachers. This may be due to the effects of teacher education courses prior to student teaching. It may be due to whatever factors operate in the selection of individuals similar to practicing teachers for a teaching career. Finally, it is at least possible that there are no differences in some respects between teachers and the population at large, that there are no teacher norms or values related to these particular aspects of teaching.

Of the ten measures which showed significant differences between beginning-student-teacher-scores and experienced-teacher-scores, only seven showed significant differences between before-scores and after-scores. These are listed in Table II.

TABLE II - Means and Tests of significant differences of students before and after completion of student teaching.

Measure	M, before (N=75)	M, after (N=72)	"t"	p
CON	53.12	54.68	8.945	.005
W	74.33	76.07	4.344	.005
P II	25.27	25.10	2.401	.01
S II	38.71	39.47	2.834	.005
I	1.58	2.04	1.419	.10
AC	2.22	3.26	3.627	.005
CO	0.52	0.63	2.569	.01

One explanation for significant differences between before-student-teaching scores and experienced-teacher-scores, and non-significant differences when before-scores and after-scores were compared, would presumably be that the distinguishing differences were not the result of student teaching. However, in five (CON, W, P II, S II, CO) of the seven cases in which there were significant differences in before-scores and experienced-scores and also in before-scores and after-scores, the changes in student-teaching-scores were away from, rather than toward, experienced teachers. Again, this could be attributed to chance. Alternatively, we could argue that the role of the student teacher is different from that of the experienced teacher. This conclusion is supported to some degree by our field and log observations.

Briefly, then, the predictions from our first hypothesis were not borne out; the hypothesis was not supported. Our predictions concerning convergence of scores were also in error. Variance (S^2) was less for experienced-teacher-scores for eleven of twenty-four measures. It was significantly smaller only in the case of the W scale (p .05), PSI (p .01) and CO (p .05). When variances for before-scores and after-scores were compared, the variance of nine measures decreased; none of these was significant.

The Second Hypothesis

In observations prior to this project, we noticed a prevailing anxiety on the part of the student teacher. For instance, one student teacher whom we interviewed experienced such a severe psychosomatic reaction upon being informed he was expected to teach the next day that he was taken to the hospital in an ambulance.[1] Later, when an observer was present to watch the student teacher teach, it was noted that although the student teacher did not seem particularly anxious during the course of the lesson, he had rubbed his knuckles raw on the edge of the teacher's desk. This student teacher had had several years of teaching experience, and enrolled in student teaching only in order to move from elementary to high school teaching. As a teacher, his performance before student teaching had been, as far as we could determine, quite satisfactory. Subsequently, he has taught successfully as a high school teacher. The anxiety of the student teachers which we had noted was far less spectacular. But we felt that the phenomenon bore an important relationship to changes relating to student teaching.

One might argue that the heightened anxiety felt by the student teacher would serve as a motivation for learning rapidly. This seemed, within limits, a reasonable extension of the "anxiety reduction" motivation schemes. Whatever the relationship between anxiety level and learning may be, it is not a simple one. Generally, the relationship seems likely to be a curvilinear one. There is, that is to say, an optimum anxiety level for maximum performance; as anxiety is increased beyond that point, performance declines.

---

[1] It is not within our competence to describe the nature of the reaction; the student teacher was informed by a physician, after electroencephalograms and a careful examination, that it was psychosomatic.

We related our observation of anxiety reduction to that learning which we specified in the first hypothesis.[1] However, even a significant reduction in anxiety would not necessarily suggest the notion that the student teacher learned the norms of experienced teachers. It could indicate the value of student teaching as a social device which made the change from college student to student teacher easier, protecting the individual from the emersion shock of too abrupt a change in role, thus being functional for the student teacher. It would also be possible, indeed it now seems to us probable, that learning other than the kind we predicted would be associated with anxiety reduction.

We employed two measurement devices in this connection. One of these was the A(Q) scale in the Q form, made up of twelve items selected from Mandler's scale. These dealt with feelings concerning teaching per se. As examples, item 23, "When I think about teaching, I am aware of an uneasy feeling," and item 119, "I expect to do poorly when I teach."

The other consisted originally of eight items; after correctional analysis, two items were eliminated. The remaining six items dealt with degree of tenseness, or uncertainty, i.e., anxiety, which the student would feel teaching a class or part of a class in the presence or absence of the teacher, principal, or others.

We predicted, of course, that anxiety would fall during the course of student teaching. This prediction was not borne out by A(Q) scores; there was no significant difference between before and after scores. However, the TIA anxiety score did change in the predicted direction, downward, for decreasing anxiety. There was a significant decrease in anxiety from beginning to end of student teaching. Fortunately, we had asked our Washington University subjects to respond several times to the TIA, and to a similar form, TIA(E) in which the same items appeared in future tense. We also obtained responses from a small group of first semester sophomores, who were still two years away from student teaching. The first semester sophomore mean score was almost the same, but slightly--not significantly--higher than the scores of prospective student teachers about a month before student teaching. Scores obtained in the first week of student teaching were lower than they had been a month before.

TABLE III

Means and Tests of Washington University Population TIA(E) and TIA Anxiety Scores

TIA Administrations	M, before (N=34)	M, after (N=34)	"t"	P
1st and 2nd	19.57	18.88	1.22	.15
2nd and 3rd	18.88	16.33	3.38	.01
3rd and 4th	16.33	14.41	2.65	.01

---

[1] P. 19.

Between the first week of student teaching and the next set of responses, collected at the end of the fourth week of student teaching, there was another decrease in TIA scores; the difference, this time, was significant (p .01). There was a further decrease in TIA anxiety scores between the fourth week and the end of student teaching (p .01). As may be seen below (Table IV), the second hypothesis was well supported by the TIA scores.

TABLE IV

Means and Test of Total Population TIA Anxiety Scores

M, before (N=75)	M, after (N=72)	"t"	p
19.96	16.73	4.16	.005

The prospective teacher's anxiety, or "tenseness," then, as measured by the TIA, stayed high, declining little until the beginning of his student teaching. It then decreased rapidly during the first part of his student teaching. Later in his student teaching it continued to decrease, although, judging from mean scores, not so rapidly.

A decline of anxiety as measured by the TIA anxiety scale, but without an accompanying decline of anxiety as measured by the A(Q) scale, requires explanation. The explanation, we feel, lies in the difference in the nature of the two scales. The A(Q) scale items seem generally to measure the respondent's reaction to teaching, or the idea of teaching, while the TIA measures reactions to teaching a class or groups in the presence of an observer other than the cooperating teacher. It would seem that student teaching does result in the reduction of a form of anxiety, specifically, anxiety which is related to teaching a group or a class in the presence of an observer who presumably is evaluating that performance. Whether the same response would have been elicited either by items involving teaching in the presence of an observer without reference to a group or class cannot be answered from these data.

The Third Hypothesis

We hypothesized that if student teaching were functional for the student teachers, then it would change his self-image to that of teacher. To test this we used the first group of questions from the TIA, following to some extent the kind of question used with medical students as reported in The Student Physician.[1] Table V below reports the means on "t"'s for the Washington University sample, and Table VI reports on the total population.

---

[1] Martin, op. cit.

TABLE V

Means and Tests of Washington University Population TIA(E) and TIA Identification Scores

TIA Administrations	M, before (N=34)	M, after (N=34)	"t"	p
1st and 2nd	17.32	20.02	2.67	.01
2nd and 3rd	20.02	20.20	--	--
3rd and 4th	20.20	22.00	2.75	.005

Our predictions were correct for the Washington University population. Their scores concerning their self-image and perception of how others saw them changed significantly during the month preceding student teaching. Unlike their anxiety scores, their self-image did not again change materially until after their first month's student teaching experience. Between the end of their fourth week in student teaching and the end of student teaching, their image of themselves as teachers strengthened significantly.

TABLE VI

Means and Test of Total Population TIA Identification Scores

M, before (N=75)	M, after (N=72)	"t"	p
20.11	22.13	2.08	.05

The change in self-image between the beginning and end of student teaching was also significant for the total population studied.

Conclusion

It would seem, from this portion of the study, that student teaching does have latent functions for the student teacher. It works to reduce the anxiety related to being evaluated in teaching a group or class. Further it works to enhance the student teacher's self-image as teacher. However, the data do not support our notion that student teachers acquire norms of an experienced teacher's subculture through the student teaching. It may be that viewing the experienced teaching population, even limiting it as we did to female elementary school teachers with more than three years' experience, is not useful in terms of a subculture. More to the point, we are inclined to abandon the theory that student teaching functions to initiate members into such a subculture. The data do indicate that learning other than anxiety reduction and changes in self-image takes place.

We turn to the next chapters for a different approach and mode of analysis in our exploration of the part student teaching plays in the making of a teacher. It is, perhaps, important to note that the phase of this study reported in the balance of this report was concurrent with the explorations reported in Chapter 2. A division of labor within the research team kept these operations to a major extent separate. Thus, the findings reported in Chapter 2 did not influence the analysis of student teacher logs reported in the following chapters.

Chapter 3

CONCEPTS TO ANALYZE THE LOGS OF STUDENT TEACHERS

One aspect of our study involved the traditional methodology of the anthropological or sociological field study.[1] We observed student teachers in their cooperating schools, interviewed them, attended the weekly meeting of student teachers on campus and joined them in drinking coffee before and after those meetings. We also talked with and listened to college supervisors of student teachers and cooperating teachers. We think these experiences helped us see what was in the logs and to understand the student teachers and what they were experiencing. However, except for a few instances which are explicitly noted, the behavior which we used for this report is the writing produced by twenty-five student teachers during their student teaching experience involving at least thirteen weeks consisting of t[illegible] half-days and one full day each week in a cooperating teacher's classroom. The subjects were all women in the elementary teaching program of a private university in the mid-West. For many years, the student teachers going through the program had been required to keep daily logs. Every few weeks during the student teaching semester, the logs were collected, examined by the college supervisor, and returned. Traditionally they furnished the college supervisors with information concerning the activities of the student teacher which supplemented the supervisor's visits to the classroom. Sometimes the log entries led to interviews between the supervisor and a student teacher in order to facilitate adjustment in the classroom or to help the student teacher with a problem she might note.

---

[1] For discussions of this methodology see the following:

(a) Howard S. Becker, "Problems of Inference and Proof in Participant Observation," American Sociological Review, XXIII (December, 1958), 652-60.

(b) Howard S. Becker *et al.*, *Boys in White* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), esp. Chapt. 1 and 2.

(c) William F. Whyte, "Observational Field-Work Methods," in M. Jahoda, M. Deutsch, and S. W. Cook (eds.), *Research Methods in Social Relations*, II (New York: Dryden Press, 1951), 493-514.

(d) Laurence Iannaccone, *The Whitman Study*, an address for the New York University School of Education Faculty Research Seminar, 1962, mimeographed.

The research staff attempted to change the traditional pattern as little as possible. Student teachers had been instructed in the past to note in their logs whatever seemed of interest to them, whatever they thought they would wish to make use of in the future, and whatever they wished cleared up in subsequent discussion with their supervisors. These traditional instructions were allowed to stand for the research subjects. In addition, they were informed that the researchers would also examine their logs in an attempt to understand what the student teachers had learned. The exploratory nature of the research was stressed to the subjects in the first general campus meeting of the student teachers. Consequently, the researchers pointed out, they could not suggest what should be included or excluded from the logs. They would be perfectly satisfied with the usual pattern of past years. One exception only to past years was made: the researchers requested that the subjects make an effort to write at least a half page per day. In general, the subjects complied with this request.[1]

Three Conceptual Frameworks

Three conceptual frameworks dominate our analysis of the student teachers' experiences as seen in their logs. First, we adapted Arnold Van Gennep's concept of life crises to the movement of students through the college preparatory program into the teaching profession.[2] Van Gennep used the term, life crises, to denote the universal stages, e.g. puberty, adulthood and marriage, through which the individual moves from one social position to another in his social life cycle from birth to death. His use of the concepts connotes a characteristic threefold sequence of separation, transition and incorporation, which he noted in his analysis of the ceremonies, the rites of passage, surrounding life crises.

We are particularly interested in his transition phase of this sequence in describing student teaching. Commenting on the ceremonies of passage to and from foreign territory, he said, "Whoever passes from one to the other finds himself physically and magico-religiously in a special situation for a certain length of time: he wavers between two worlds. It is this situation which I have designated a transition, and . . . this symbolic and spatial area of transition may be found. . . in all ceremonies which accompany the passage from one social and magico-religious position to another."[3] He pointed out that "A suspension of the usual rules of living. ..

---

[1] Twenty-five of the logs selected at random were retained by the research staff at the end of the year with the permission of the student teachers. For obvious reasons, we cannot express our gratitude to these, now former student teachers, by listing their real names.

[2] Arnold Van Gennep, Rites of Passage, (London: Routledge and Paul, 1960), p. 1-14.

[3] Ibid, p. 18.

(constitutes) an essential element of this phase."[1] Student teaching is a unique phase of teacher development, and its characteristic interaction sets may be seen as suspending the usual rules of interaction in the lives of teachers and college students.[2] Student teaching may thus be viewed as a transitional phase in a sequence, with the college teacher preparatory providing a separation from adolescence and general education in preparation for the responsibilities of adulthood and a career. Incorporation occurs after student teaching during the early years of teaching.

While student teaching may be viewed as transitional in nature, it extends through an appreciable period of time. Within this transition there exists another sequence of separation, transition, and incorporation. Similarly, Van Gennep found that there were "certain instances where the transition possesses an autonomy of its own and a secondary system inserted within a ceremonial whole."[3] It is this fact--" the existence of transitional periods which sometimes acquire a certain autonomy. . .that provides an orientation for understanding the intricacies and order of rites. . within the transitional period."[4] The entries of the student teachers' logs suggest they perceived a characteristic pattern of movement *within student teaching* which they interpreted as evidence of separation and incorporation. The progress of the student teacher within student teaching can be described using the Van Gennep framework. Some indications of perceived incorporation into the status, classroom teacher, are present in the logs of our student teachers. But evidence of separation from the college student status may be seen in the prospective student teacher's relationship to the university long before she becomes a student teacher. Elements of separation still appear near the end of student teaching. Student teaching itself is primarily transitional in nature. This is important for us to keep in mind, since we shall be using the student teacher's logs for the bulk of our description, and the logs focused on the smaller sequence *within* student teaching, a sequence which is in itself a perceived career crisis for the student teacher.[5]

---

[1] Van Gennep, *op. cit.*, p. 115.

[2] See the discussion of these, particularly the dyad below, p. 41 *passin.*

[3] Van Gennep, *op. cit.*, p. 185.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 192.

[5] See above pp. 4-9. Further evidence of the career significance of student teaching may be seen in the requirement by the college placement office that one of three letters of recommendation in their client's file be written by the cooperating teacher.

Interaction sets. Second, the concept of interaction set from Arensberg and Chapple is applied to the social structures in which the student teacher operates.[1] As used here, interaction set refers to a pattern of interpersonal relations involving the student teacher as a participant in the elementary classroom where she does her student teaching. An interaction set in student teaching is defined by three related elements: the participants in the set; their relationship in terms of superordination-subordination; and the pattern of activities and customary behavior of the student teacher in the interaction set. In general, three types of indicators are used to identify the element of superordination-subordination: the legal or formal organizational authority pattern when it exists in a given interaction set; the pattern of initiation and response in the interpersonal relationships and activities of participants in a set; and the direction of influence flow concerning attitudes or points of view as revealed by student teachers' logs.

A large number of possible interaction sets involving student teachers were identified from the armchair at the beginning of this study. However, the student teachers' logs indicate that only three need concern us as common to student teaching. The observer set, the dyad and the teaching set are the context for almost every log entry. The first of these interaction sets involves the student teacher as an observer. The cooperating teacher is the superordinate and functions as the classroom teacher with the pupils as subordinate learners and the student teacher as observer. The tasks of this interaction set revolve around the teaching-learning process in the classroom. In one sense, the presence of the student teacher is incidental and her learning a by-product of the main operation. The classroom of teacher and pupils does not come into existence because of her. On the contrary, she is there as an observer because it already exists. The dyad, cooperating teacher-student teacher, may be seen as coordinating the other two sets. The pattern of authority is clear: the cooperating teacher is superordinate and the student teacher subordinate. As seen in the logs, the dyad's typical activities are two in nature. Information is exchanged between the two participants. This may range from the cooperating teacher's giving the student teacher information, advice, and directions, to her providing the student teacher with feed-back and evaluation concerning work done in other interaction sets. Also, it functions to make plans and set into motion student teacher activities in the other sets. The dyad determines when these sets come into existence and what will be accomplished in them. The third interaction set involves the student teacher actually teaching. The participants are the student teacher and pupils. These may be a small group of the entire class.[1] In the teaching set, the student teacher is a superordinate and the pupils are subordinates. The cooperating teacher may be an observer or out of the set, as when she leaves the room or works with a second group while the student teacher works with the first.

---

[1] Eliot D. Chapple (with the collaboration of Conrad M. Arensberg), "Measuring Human Relations: An Introduction to the Study of the Interaction of Individuals", Genetic Psychology Monographs, XXII, (February, 1940), 3-147.

The observer set, the dyad, and the teaching set denote three characteristic patterns of interpersonal relationships and behavior as revealed by the student teaching logs. They are common to all the logs. These social structures appear on almost every page of each of the logs used in this study, and the events reported arise within the context of one or more of these three interaction sets. There is variance among the logs as to which set is most prominent at a given time. There are differences among the subjects on the extent to which the dyad, for example, is the center of attention. But one or another of these sets is virtually omnipresent throughout the student teaching semester.

Perspective. The concept of perspective provided a third useful tool for handling the student teachers' view of their world and their responses to it, as seen in their logs. Becker and his colleagues use the concept of perspective to refer to:[2] ". . .a coordinate set of ideas and actions a person uses in dealing with some problematic situation, to refer to a person's ordinary way of thinking and feeling about and acting in such a situation." They distinguish it:[2]

> ...from two somewhat similar concepts: attitude and value. Perspectives differ from values in being situationally specific; they are patterns of thought and actions which have grown up in response to a specific set of institutional pressures and serve as a solution to the problems those pressures create...perspectives are distinguished from attitudes by the fact that they contain actions as well as ideas and dispositions to act.

We are concerned precisely with the development of a coordinate set of ideas and actions about teaching built up in response to the institutional pressures of student teaching as these are seen in the student teachers' logs. The changes which take place in the student teachers' perspective are of particular interest to us. They take place as the student teachers' patterns of interaction change. The prominence in the logs which is held by the observer set gives way to the teaching set, and usually the social distance in the dyad decreases visibly. The student teacher may even report an occasional reversal of the normal flow of origination and response of interaction in the dyad as she initiates activity and is followed by her cooperating teacher. Not only does her perspective concerning teaching change but, as she moves from the observer to the teaching set she also perceives herself as successfully making the transition of separation from college student to incorporation into the status of classroom teacher.

---

[1] While the distinction between these is important for some purposes and was used for analysis during the bulk of this study, from the point of view of examining the process of student teaching it does not make enough of a difference in the logs to justify an additional concept in this report.

[2] Howard S. Becker, et. al, Boys in White, (Chicago:University of Chicago Press, 1961), p. 34.

[3] Ibid., p. 37.

Separation

For the student preparing to teach, the process of separation from the status of college student begins before student teaching and is completed with graduation at the earliest. The process of separation is thus an extended one. Apart from the informal communication of attitudes and information by the student teachers of one "generation" to the education majors who come after them, the University, in a variety of formal and semi-formal ways, prepares the student for separation. As early as the second half of the sophomore year in some cases, the program advisor in the education department calls the student's attention to the need to keep the last semester as free of class work as possible in order to have time for student teaching. Discussion of what will happen "when you go into student teaching" crops up in a variety of education courses and most often the semester preceding student teaching. Finally, the office of the Director of Student Teaching sends out information and requires the filling out of applications for student teaching the preceding semester. Students make requests for specific grade levels and schools in which they wish to teach. All of this is valuable and necessary to coordinate the student's program and the University's operation. It also communicates to the student the importance of student teaching and the beginning of a process of separation from the status of college student.

One high point in the process of separation occurs with the first meeting of all the elementary student teachers, the college supervisors and the Director of Student Teaching. With rare exception, all of the student teachers present will have been assigned to a school and classroom. The meeting is designed to give the student teachers advice and information on how to behave and on what is to be expected during the course of student teaching. Emphasis is placed upon the need to remember at all times that the cooperating teacher in the classroom is in charge and that "we," the University, are present on sufferance. To quote a statement repeated with slight variation in four different semesters, "Remember, it (the classroom) is their playhouse. If we don't like it, we don't have to go back next year." The implication as to who has control of their future in the elementary classroom is clear. Indeed, there is perhaps more danger that the beginning student teacher may overestimate than underestimate the extent to which she is being "cut loose" from the University.

Similarly, the student teachers are told, "you are not there to criticize her teaching. You may not like everything you see, but your cooperating teacher is an experienced teacher and you will be able to learn much from her." They are cautioned at some length not to dress like college coeds but to use their eyes and follow the pattern of dress and use of cosmetics prevalent in the building to which they have been sent. They are urged to wait and see, for example, whether smoking is permitted in the teachers' lounge before beginning to smoke themselves. In short, and with a variety of specific examples, they are told to obey the norms and conventions for teachers of the school in which they will work.

While the purpose of this is to help the student teacher avoid "getting off on the wrong foot," it contains many elements of the classic ceremonials of separation. In effect, the superordinate at the University, Director of Elementary Student Teaching, says to the beginning student teacher, "We, the University, are turning you over to another set of superordinates in another social organization which we do not control." The University also says by this, "We expect you to avoid trouble by accepting a subordinate status in that organization, by keeping criticism to yourself, and by adopting the norms and mores of that social organization." Thus viewed, the first meeting of student teachers at the University is a ceremonial rite, classifiable as a separation rite, in the progress of the student teacher. The use of the pronouns "we" referring to college personnel and "they" referring to the elementary school personnel coupled with the frequently used verbs, "going" and "sent" give evidence as to the nature of this ceremony.

The separation expressed verbally at the beginning of student teaching is a genuine reflection of reality in that the student teacher must live in two distinct organizations, the University and the cooperating school. The significance of this may perhaps be seen when one takes into account the dilemma of the college supervisor. College supervisors frequently feel impotent in the face of teaching of which they disapprove. The dilemma faced is one they referred to repeatedly before and during the study.[1] If they disapprove of a cooperating teacher's pattern they have essentially two alternatives. They may "pull the student teacher out of that class." This is not unheard of and occurred in the program under consideration, as far as the researchers could estimate, about once in every fifty to a hundred cases. In short, it is a drastic step. It creates problems in the relationship between the university and the public schools in the area. Much of the time it leaves ill-will behind. If, as is often the case, there are other student teachers in the same building, transferring one student teacher may be seen even more seriously as a reflection upon her cooperating teacher's ability. Serious as this is at any time, the more weeks that pass, the more difficult it becomes for all parties concerned to move a student teacher to another cooperating teacher. If the situation is not bad enough to "pull her out," or if it is too late in the semester, then the college supervisor tends to do as one of this staff did in the fall of 1960, before the present research. He said to his "girl," "Look, I know this is not good teaching and you know it isn't. But there's nothing we can do about it. You have to live with it for the rest of the semester. But heaven help you if I catch you doing this in your classroom next year." Is it necessary to add that that empty threat could hardly be carried out the year after?

---

[1] This is based on field notes begun a year before this study.

The alternative to moving a student teacher is helping her get along in the situation. Discussion with university personnel suggests this often involves three related tasks for them. They do not use this language, but one of the tasks is fostering the creation of an efficient dyad, i.e. one which is satisfactory to both participants. Here, the college personnel get "the girl to make the best of the situation."

A second task which is frequently undertaken by the college supervisor when he (as often she) finds one of his girls in a "bad situation" is that of subtly influencing the movement of the particular student teacher to the teaching interaction set. This he can do by several requests that he be given a day when he can come out and see her teach. Ostensibly and in fact, part of his responsiblity in the student teaching program entails observing the student teacher's "progress." (That is the word used by the practitioners involved.) Asking to know when the student teacher will teach is customary behavior for the college supervisor. It saves him trips. It also, inevitably, puts pressure on the cooperating teacher to move the student teacher into the teaching set, if this movement has not yet taken place when such a request is made. Effectiveness at this and similar subtle guidance of the student teacher's movements through interaction sets in the classroom varies with college supervisors. When the student teacher in a "bad situation" is fortunate enough to have a well trained, perceptive college supervisor who also has high status locally, she is fortunate indeed. Then even the cooperating teacher's regular pattern of teaching may be altered to help the student teacher.[1] But this is rare. Usually, only the impersonal machinery briefly sketched above can be used to help modify the classroom situation.

Separation Continues In Student Teaching. The earliest experiences reported in the student teachers' logs indicate their college student status and except for the significance they now attach to the observer set, could easily have been written by them before student teaching. The social structure which provides the context for the first days is the observer interaction set. For the subjects of this study it can be categorically stated that the observer set precedes the teaching set. The student teachers have participated in that interaction set before, as college students, e.g. taking Educational Psychology and Elementary Education courses. The set is not unique to student teaching. However, while it may be a reminder of their college student status, the observer set has a different meaning for them from the meaning it had for them as college students. It now functions as a position from which to move into the teaching set, and that move is treated by student teachers as a measure of successful transtion.[1] The observer set is an element of the larger transitional phase which is student teaching, but it is viewed by the student teachers as a position from which to move.

---

[1] Our interview data indicates a few cases of this. Interestingly, the college supervisor involved was the Director of Student Teaching himself. He represents the university in discussions with school superintendents concerning student teaching, elementary as well as secondary.

Indeed, in the early weeks, the girls and the college supervisors measure a student teacher's progress by the answer to the question, "Have you done any teaching yet?" For the college supervisor this is most often intended to give him information on how the cooperating teacher is working. But for the girls it is a question which might better be phrased as, "Am I ready to do some teaching?" Sarah, for example, came in to speak with her college advisor at the end of the sixth week of the fall semester in 1961. She had had three years of experience teaching in Hebrew School. She said, "I thought I was ahead of the others. Now, I find I'm behind. They've all done some teaching." Disregarding the objective question of whether indeed they had all done some teaching, the fact was that at least most of them had and the student teachers on campus had exchanged information on this score. During that fall semester, one of the researchers had coffee with a half dozen of the student teachers every Friday afternoon after the student teachers' general meeting. The question, "Have you taught yet?" was raised by the girls of one another at every such session up to the fourth week. From that point on, the question was asked only of Sarah; all the other members of the coffee group had taught.

Sarah's words themselves warrant attention. The use of the words "ahead" and "behind" indicate not only comparison with the others but that Sarah saw her student teaching experience as involving a progress, a walk or path--in Van Gennep's terms, a passage. Further, it was for her a path in which one could be ahead or behind others. Finally, her measure of where she stood on this path was determined by her perception that the other student teachers had participated in the teaching set while she was still only a participant in the observer set. For Sarah, the process of separation was stalled. In her logs she wrote, "I feel like a fifth grader in this class."

Participating in the teaching interaction set is, for the student teacher, evidence of success in progressing through the career crisis of student teaching.[1] The student teacher's observation is a preparation to teach the particular children of the specific class involved. Inez says, at the close of the first week, "By now I have been able to estimate the abilities of most of the children and I am anxious to see some of them work so I can become more familiar with them." Inez has observed their work for a week. What does she mean by seeing "some of them work?" It is probable she means work with her. On the next day she writes, "Finally, Mrs. Ianni asked me to prepare a science lesson on snakes. I am going to give her a brief lesson plan." Inez also seems anxious to get beyond the observation set to the teaching set even though it is only the first week. Her experiences during the first week have included for her not only learning about the pupils preparatory to engaging in the teaching set but also some interaction with pupils. On the first day she wrote, "My cooperating teacher gave me most of the text books and teacher guides and a planning book. She also gave me a few sheets that the school system put out on class order, evaluation, etc. A few individual questions were referred to me, but I spent most of the day in observation."

---

[1] In this connection it may be significant that the language of education students suggests they see student teaching as requiring them to take a more active part in learning than they had on campus. Thus, in the language of education students, one "takes" college courses, college classes "come" on Mondays and Fridays, but one "goes" into student teaching. It never "comes" to them.

Inez's log differed from most of the others only in regard to the speed with which the teaching set appeared. On the first day some pupils' "questions" were referred to her. But even though the teaching set came earlier for Inez than for most student teachers she said, "Finally" in reference to the preparation for this. The relief implicit in that word makes sense when related to Sarah's concern with being "behind" and when we remember that the observer set is characteristic of the college education student's status. It is paralleled by a number of similar statements from many of the subjects. Also at the end of her first week in the observer set, Helen says, "This week I did not feel that I should correct students while she was in charge. She has said nothing about this to me. I am not sure what she expects or wants me to do unless she tells me specifically." Running through most of the logs in the first weeks there is a similar note of dependence which is related to the observer set. They observe; they are not quite sure what to look for; they breathe a sigh of relief as they are given instructions by the cooperating teacher concerning such things as what to look for, which children are problems, what the teacher's goal is, etc. In the absence of such cues from the cooperating teacher, Ellen, who began her first week with a substitute in place of her cooperating teacher, writes, "She still didn't know what to do with me...I have learned a great deal this week and I know the children pretty well, but I feel so lost with nothing to do except help and watch."[2]

---

[1] This may not be the cooperating teacher's perception at all. Discussions with several cooperating teachers suggest that it may only reflect the fact that as the semester moves on, most cooperating teachers feel it is necessary. The calendar, not readiness, is often the key to when a student teacher enters the teaching set.

[2] Underscore ours.

The expressed concern for what to do and what is right is characteristic of the observer set particularly in the early stage of student teaching. It is also characteristic of the person in transition between statuses, especially as he does not know what is the appropriate behavior between worlds.[1] Felt dependency is also evidence of transition. This is a situation from which to move as soon as possible. The observer set is also the element of student teaching most like experiences which student teachers had in college courses. Movement from it is perceived by student teachers as transition. But the anxiety and dependency expressed in the observer set is characteristic of persons in transition. The student teacher may be viewed as in the transition from college student to teacher throughout the entire semester and not only as she moves from the observer to the teaching set. Separation from college continues. But the sequence reflected in the student teacher's log is, to adopt Van Gennep, a transition possessing an autonomy of its own, a secondary system inserted within the whole transition.[2]

We turn, now, to an examination of student teaching as seen in the diaries or logs of student teachers. We will concentrate upon the secondary system of separation, transition and incorporation within the transitional whole of student teaching. Chapter Four pays particular attention to the dyad and the student teacher's movements between the other interaction sets. The teaching set and the student teacher's development of her new perspective will be given detailed attention in Chapter 5.

---

[1] Pp. 31, 32.

[2] P. 31.

Chapter 4

THE DYAD: SOCIAL STRUCTURE OF TRANSITION

The dyad composed of a cooperating teacher and a student teacher is a social relationship in elementary school teaching which is unique to student teaching. It is the characteristic social structure of the transition which student teaching epitomizes. For several reasons, the dyad is the critical interaction set for the student teacher. The university "tells" her so.[1] The formal authority system of the elementary school in which she does her student teaching reinforces this. Not the least of these reasons is the recommendation for a teaching job which the placement office expects the student teacher to get from her cooperating teacher. The dyad is the place where she is given explanations concerning her observation of the cooperating teacher's work. Discussions concerning her plan of operations in the teaching set go on in this. Here is where the student teacher receives the cooperating teacher's evaluation of her performance in the teaching set and advice for the next time. Finally, the dyad is the social mechanism which determines the student teacher's movement between the observer and teaching set. If for no other reason, the dyad is crucial to the student teacher because it governs her transition between observer and teaching sets. It governs the transitional phase within student teaching.

Examination of internal aspects of the dyad and its relation to the other interaction sets helps us to understand the progress of the student teacher during the semester of student teaching. The logs of student teachers usually indicate that the social distance in the dyads between cooperating teachers and student teachers changes during the semester. The internal changes in the dyads appear to be related to the student teachers' movement between the observer and teaching set. Movement into the teaching set presents the student teachers with a problematic situation. The solution of this requires a perspective concerning teaching which differs significantly from that which they bring with them into student teaching from college. The information and advice which they receive from cooperating teachers facilitates the development of their new perspective.

We will next examine in detail the logs of five student teachers to see how the dyad works as the student teacher goes through student teaching. These five were chosen at random from our twenty five.[2] For convenience we call our student teachers Alice, Betty, Carol, Donna and Ellen. We will also use names for their respective cooperating teachers beginning with the letters A, B, C, D, and E.

---

[1] Pp. 35, 36.

[2] P. 16.

Alice: Social Distance and Influence

Alice began student teaching in a suburban middle-class kindergarten in the fall of 1961 at the beginning of the public school semester and before the university began its fall semester. For the first weeks, the entries in her log were brief. Further, until the sixth week Alice did not refer to the dyad or her cooperating teacher at all. This is unusual. In an interview during the fifth week in the response to the question of why she was not writing a half page a day, Alice said, "I know I'm not, (writing a half page) but I didn't think I could write what I was thinking." Assured by the researcher that what she wrote would not be held against her, she began to expand her log in the sixth week. What she thought she could not write became clear on Monday of the sixth week. Her log reads as follows, "Begin to put down all the horrors or surprises I have felt!" In addition and unknown to the research staff, Alice began at this time to set up a balance sheet entitled "Lessons I've Learned" apart from her log. (This she turned over to the researchers at the end of the semester.)[1] On the balance sheet too, Alice began with the sub-category of "horrors" which she crossed out at some later date and renamed "surprises." Similarly, in the parallel column which she first entitled, "What I do," she crossed out the word "do" and wrote "learned" instead.

Her first mention of her cooperating teacher occurred on Tuesday of that sixth week of student teaching. "Miss Adams says that she has the children themselves help her do this painstaking job (cleaning out paint jars). I was amazed at this; taking out the children's time to do something which SHE should have done out of school sometime."[2]

She next explicitly referred to the dyad in the following week. "Miss Adams showed me one of the new teachers sitting down on a ledge on the playground--only looking at one end of the play area. She could not see all her kids that way. Miss Adams said that a teacher should try not tor relax so much on the playground because she's responsible! 'We always stand up and look in all directions.' " The dyad functions as a bridge across which information flows. Its direction is from Miss Adams who "showed me" and "said that." Statements reported as made in the dyad continue to be of the type quoted above, giving advice to Alice. For example, in the seventh week Alice noted, "Miss Adams suggested that I play softer and slower." The vehemence of her ninth week comment is interesting. "Miss Adams says always leave enough time for putting on wraps! They MUST be out by 3:00!"

The dyadic bridge is not only a source of information and suggestions. It is also an influence structure. For example, in the tenth week Alice's log reads: "I tried to play softer and slower today...I have a tendency to hurry the music, Miss Adams said." Her balance sheet offers an even better example.[1] Seven of the twelve paired items listed there were reported in her log as flowing from discussions in the dyad. We cannot tell from her log whether the other five were also discussed in that interaction set. But we know over half of Alice's "Lessons I've Learned" came out of the dyad. Her balance sheet indicates a flow of influence on the student teacher from the cooperating teacher which is consistent with the formal authority relationship.

---

[1] See Appendix VII.

[2] Capitalization, punctuation and underscore hers. Except for spelling and change of names, quotations from the logs follow them exactly unless otherwise noted.

The relationship between the participants in the dyadic interaction set does not remain constant. Specifically, the social distance between the superordinate and subordinate members decreases. The word "we" as used for the dyad by most of the student teachers illustrates this. Characteristically it appears in reference to the dyad between the third and ninth week, most often about the sixth week. The point in terms of the calendar is not, perhaps, important. What seems more important is the sequence. The dyad is referred to at first as "My cooperating teacher and I," then "Miss------------and I" and later "we." After "we" makes its first appearance in relation to the dyad it tends to recur more often. Thus Alice used it in the seventh week, returned to "Miss Adams and I" in the eighth week and picked up "we" again in the ninth week. From that point on it is the label for the dyad in Alice's log. In the eleventh week Alice's log gives us further evidence of a change in the dyad's internal structure. She wrote, "The upper grades were out of the building so I suggested we use the gym...we played games in the gym." Here Alice initiated successfully in the dyad. Some such instance is found in most of the logs during the latter half of the semster. Related to this is the longest day in Alice's log, a full page. It is concerned exclusively with the kindergarten's evening Christmas party. "At 6:30 we were ready to put surplices and bows on all the youngsters...The children, I expect were all worn out from the excitement and so were we." As far as Alice's log goes, on this her last night in the school, she perceived herself as part of a teaching team, a junior partner if not equal to Miss Adams. The parents were seen by her as treating her as they treated Miss Adams, "The room mothers gave both Miss Adams and me a lovely corsage. All in all it was a very wonderful evening."

In summarizing Alice's comments regarding the dyad, it seems that the absence of reference to it during the first five weeks of Alice's student teaching was due to her concern over putting on paper her negative feelings about Miss Adams' teaching. In the sixth week when she first mentioned the dyad she also began her summary balance sheet of "Lessons I've Learned" with the word "horrors" in the sub-heading. Later this was changed to "surprises" and an examination of the items indicates that she used the balance sheet for fewer "horrors" than she seemed at first (end of fifth week) to have expected. Of greater importance, however, is that "What I learned" consists of a series of explanations as to why she, Alice should do as Miss Adams has done. In no instance listed where Alice was horrified, surprised, or in disagreement with Miss Adams did she remain so. On the contrary, she accepted Miss Adams as a model, and the dyadic interaction set with its exchange of information provided a bridge of influence by which Miss Adams' perspective of teaching was transmitted to Alice. Concurrent with the increase of Miss Adams' influence was a decrease in the social distance in the dyad. In the second half of the semester Alice felt free enough to..."suggest we use the gym" and they did. This more relaxed atmosphere in the dyad is perhaps clearest in the lengthy discussion of the Christmas party on Alice's last evening in the kindergarten. Now the dyad involved a cooperative, almost peer relationship in the operation of a complex evening party with children and parents. In a sense what had begun a clearly superordinate-subordinate relation had become for Alice at least a more relaxed partnership. She was no longer uncomfortable, nor was she "horrified" or surprised. Neither was she still critical of Miss Adams' operations.

---

[1] See Appendix VII.

Betty: Beating the Clock

Betty did her student teaching in an upper grade classroom in an upper-middle class suburb. She usually wrote a page a day. Throughout her log she was primarily concerned with the dyad.

Mr. Brown, her cooperating teacher, briefed her on the first day on the children, his procedures for the class, and the school rules. She spent most of the first week in the observer set. Betty also assisted with a few teaching chores, e.g. distributed supplies, ran off some dittoes, helped a few individual children with arithmetic. During the second week Betty continued largely in the observer set and helped correct papers. This gave her opportunities to interact with individual pupils explaining their mistakes and helping them.

Throughout this early period, the dyad functioned to give her information and suggestions and to set into motion activities outside the dyad as well. For instance, in the second week Mr. Brown suggested she prepare a lesson on decimals. Betty's log reads, several times after describing Mr. Brown's suggestions, "This I did." However, as in Alice's case, the cooperating teacher's information and suggestions were not simply accepted without question by Betty at this time. On Tuesday of the second week, she wrote, "Mr. Brown gave me some suggestions..." concerning her movements about the room as she helped pupils. He suggested she plan her movements ahead, say good morning to the pupils as she first came to them and when helping individuals, "Don't kneel at their desks." Betty added, "I question what is better here." In the third week she said, One question I have about his procedure is whether or not criticizing individual children helps them or not especially in front of the entire group."

The basic pattern indicated above continued for several weeks. Betty recorded Mr. Brown's suggestions and often indicated she was trying to follow them. They were concerned with increasing the efficiency of her movements in the room and with reducing the complexity of her teaching when she engaged in the teaching set. As an example of the latter, she noted in connection with a language lesson that Mr. Brown "suggested I speed it up and just give the definitions of the words instead of talking about each of them." He also suggested she cut the number of words, use the reading text glossary instead of the dictionary, and when looking at a picture, "Make sure to keep them (the pupils) all together instead of letting some of them continue reading." She noted again as on every report of discussion with Mr. Brown concerning her work in teaching sets, "I had to be more careful about the time." The evaluation of Betty's performance in the teaching set occurred in the dyad.

Throughout the first five weeks we find statements which question the accuracy or wisdom of the cooperating teacher's infomation or advice. For example, after Mr. Brown had offered variation in maturity as an explantion concerning inattention she had noted in some of the pupils and asked him to explain, Betty wrote, "I wonder if this was really just because of the maturity of the different groups." On Wednesday of the fourth week in a similar vein she said, "The other thing that I wonder about, Mr. Brown had me...hand out new books while the pupils were taking a test. It would seem to me that they would be distracted and want to hurry through the test so that they could look at the books." But more often, even during the first five weeks, Betty's statements in her log concerning the dyad are similar to the following in the third week, "I had them divide into three groups--this was Mr. Brown's suggestion."

Thursday of the fourth week, Betty's log focuses on the comments in the dyad by Mr. Brown concerning her performance in the teaching set involving a decimal division lesson to a group of pupils. "Mr. Brown sat in on the lesson and criticized my work. These are the things I have to work on." The list which follows involves better organization of the seating arrangement of the group around the table, techniques for expediting movement through the planned activities and making sure that when one pupil talks the others listen. The only portion of that day's log which refers to the content of the decimal lesson follows: "Mr. Brown said that I put them in a position where they needed to know how to read decimals, and Mr. Brown felt that this was off the track of the lesson--decimal division.[1] Here, however, I question whether this is incorrect. Also I have to be careful to draw all the children into the conversation; will get others talking if I don't do this." She continued this day's log with the notation that again she failed to keep within the time planned. She ended with the statement, "I also have to learn how to handle suggestions without discussing them when the time is up."

Betty's statements help define the nature of the cooperating teacher's observational role in the teaching set in contrast to the observer set. In the teaching set, it is legitimate for the observer to "criticize" the student teacher's performance. In fact, he is expected to do this. By contrast, as she was told when she left the college, the student teacher in the observer set is not expected to criticize. "I wonder" is as far as Betty goes. However similar the teaching process may be in each set, the relative status of the cooperating teacher and student teacher does not change. It may also be noted that Mr. Brown's criticisms and suggestions were all intended to expedite the lesson by the teacher's (in this case Betty) keeping control of pupil behavior on the one hand and limiting the lesson itself on the other hand. Reading decimals is treated as irrelevant for this lesson. While Betty, perhaps because of her training, questioned this criticism, she accepted the rest of what Mr. Brown had to tell her. Finally, as is often the case, her experience in the teaching set validated many of Mr. Brown's criticisms and suggestions. She did run out of time. The importance of running out of time may be judged differently by college professors and classroom teachers, but Betty's superior in this classroom was not her college professor.

---

[1] It is interesting to ask what an arithmetic expert would think of this.

During the fifth week, faced with a visit by the college supervior, Betty wrote, "Mr. Brown was most helpful in putting me at ease, and offering me suggestions." This suggests that the college supervisor was seen by Betty as having power over her. However, it also indicates that the dyad can (indeed in log after log it is seen that it does) provide help to the student teacher in dealing with the problem of proving she is progressing successfully through student teaching. There is a hint here in Betty's words suggesting gratitude for Mr. Brown's help, and of a drawing together within the dyad when faced by this visitation.

Betty's log continues until the ninth week with increasing attention on Betty's behavior in the teaching set and suggestions from Mr. Brown for expediting her teaching. At the beginning of the ninth week the dyad was referred to by Betty as "we" for the first time. "Today we were going to have me teach all day." Again she noted Mr. Brown's advice, characteristically concerned with how she moved, the placing of pupils so they could be heard well when speaking, etc. In connection with criticisms not perhaps purely administrative in nature she wrote, "I should not let them change the subject when I ask them a question." He also pointed out that she let mis-statements of fact (in social studies) pass and should instead correct them. She added, "I did this, however, to the best of my ability." She also wrote, "I should also tell them to make notes quickly and then listen not to have pencil in hand all the time." Betty continued with an event which may be related to the fact that she began this day calling the dyad "we": "Mr. Brown and I worked out what the new reading groups would be. We used the Iowa Basic...what the top group would do was my suggestion...my intention here is to talk with each child..."

As in Alice's case,[1] when a suggestion made by the person low in status within the dyad is followed, it seems to signify a new stage of development for the dyad. Coupled with the use of "we" which turns up with greater frequency later in the log, it suggests a decrease in social distance within the dyad. The evidence indicates related changes in the student teacher's perspective as well. Seldom after the fifth week does the phrase "I wonder" reappear in Betty's log. Further, Betty's log, although continuing explicitly to indicate the discussions reported in the dyad, uses the phrase, "Mr. Brown suggested" less and less often. Betty instead reports these as "I could save myself time and steps if I were to go up the middle aisle." On the last day of the ninth week she writes, "I should also have something for them to do when they finish their work at their desks so that they will listen later...Mr. Brown said, my relation with the children is very important because my methods will change--relation will not..I need to free myself and not get tied down with one group. The way I go about doing something is as important as the end results..."

---

[1] p. 44.

It can be seen that the internal change in the dyad made it more comfortable for Betty. But it did not decrease Brown's influence. If anything, implicit in her statements was Betty's acceptance of his criticisms and suggestions as her own. Of particular interest is the last generalization quoted. The importance of time and teaching means, rather than ends or learning goals was stressed repeatedly in Betty's log. It is frequently this concern for time which explains the student teacher's concern for discipline. On the last day of the ninth week she wrote, "He pointed out that I need to make sure to get people places on time."[1] "I talked to the children and told them that...they would stay late after school for every minute late (from lunch). This seemed to make quite an impression on them." On the same day her log reads, "One of the children acted up so I took him out of the room and talked to him" and Mr. Brown approved.

We see Betty getting tougher on the children. To this should be added another comment from this ninth week. In the third week Betty had expressed concern, "I question," she said, "the value of the teacher's singling out a pupil for verbal attack." Now, she wrote, "In reading I should not be so tactful in telling a child he is lazy and should really make the point felt." Between the ninth week and the end of student teaching, the phrase "I wonder" or "I question" appears only once. In the eleventh week she wrote, "It seems we are using writing as a punishment and this I do not think is good as it will put a bitter taste in their mouths." This, it seems, was too gross a violation of her previous training. In contrast to this one question of Mr. Brown's technique in the last half of the semester, stands the fact that not a single week of the first half passed without one or more such criticisms or wonders by Betty.

---

[1] We note here the influence of the school's schedule on the elementary classroom.

It should finally be pointed out that Brown's continuous concern for time, getting through the lesson in time and his related suggestions concerning means for controlling pupil behavior and simplifying the teaching task were at first questioned by Betty, but not after the ninth week. Betty's own statement in relation to time in the ninth week seems important. Describing the results of the teaching interaction set she wrote, "However, I found that I was really going to have a problem getting to all three groups in the time allowed, and yet keeping them going on something worthwhile." In passing we note that one way to accomplish this which was suggested by the logs is by redefining "worthwhile" in terms of means such as workbooks, rather than by objectives beyond the immediate lesson. More important, Betty learned by her experience with the clock and the children that beating the clock is a necessary game to play. ("...I found...really.") Mr. Brown's suggestions, however she might question them from the point of view of learning theory did help beat the clock and cover the lesson.

To summarize: Betty's log is concerned in large part with the flow of communication in the dyad. Her entries concerning the dyad indicate the superordination of the cooperating teacher and the subordination of the student teacher. Betty paid considerable attention to Mr. Brown's suggestions and advice. Much of this related to her specific behavior as she moved around the room and was especially intended to "speed up" the teaching operation. But Betty had trouble in accepting the idea that anything other than the specific objective of the specific lesson of the day is irrelevant and time wasting.[1] She did not appear to be "horrified" as Alice was, but she tended to raise questions: "I wonder", she repeated. With the ninth week Betty began to use the pronoun "we" when talking about the dyad. Her suggestion for the reading groups was adopted. Mr. Brown was also seen by Betty as helping her perform in the teaching set by speeding up the lesson, urging her to be aware of the room specifically to prevent disruption and delay in the lesson and to cut out irrelevant discussion. She saw him continuing to help her save "steps and time," keep the children busy ...so that they will listen..." and "not get tied to one group." The trouble Betty perceived herself having with time in the teaching set functioned to validate what Brown told her repeatedly inside the dyad. She "should" crack down openly on a "lazy" pupil. Only once in the second half of the semester, did Betty indicate "wonder" again.

It may be, precisely as Brown pointed out, that her teaching methods will change but that her relationship to the pupils will not. She had learned to keep moving, to keep them moving, to stick to a few brief and simply handled points in a lesson, to keep control of the pupils' behavior, and to eliminate discussion irrelevant to the immediate lesson plan. In short, the dyad provided a bridge for transmission of the cooperating teacher's advice concerned with beating the clock in the classroom. The response of the pupils to her behavior as she followed Mr. Brown's suggestions reinforced that behavior. Following his advice worked to cover the lesson on time. For Alice and for Betty, Miss Adams and Mr. Brown were, in the latter half of the semester, more than just authority figures in the dyad; they were right. Their suggestions worked.

Carol: Simplifying the Lessons

Carol did her student teaching with Mrs. Callahan in the third grade of a middle-class suburban school. She wrote on the average of a little less than a half page a day. She, too, spent the entire first week in the observer set and undertook several activities in the teaching set in the second week. Carol spent the third week again in the observer set, and in the fourth week, with responsibility for the slowest of the three reading groups, re-entered the teaching set as a regular part of her student teaching. The proportion of time she spent in the teaching set increased over the weeks as she was given responsiblity first for spelling, then arithmetic and other subjects in addition to reading. This is the typical progress of the student teacher.

To avoid repetition, we will deal more briefly with Carol's log where it repeats what we noted above. Carol's log does not indicate that the social distance in the dyad decreased. Neither is there indication that Mrs. Callahan's influence over her increased. Nor, with rare exception, did Carol question Mrs. Callahan's operations. Instead, on the first day, Carol records with vigor her acceptance of Mrs. Callahan's statements. "Talked mostly with cooperating teacher. Teacher was emphatic about flexibility of classroom and daily program. She is efficient and values 'professional' procedues. She said to be at school by 8:35." ..."Three reading groups. Teacher doesn't like to name them. Good idea!"[1] But even Carol, the least critical of all twenty-five, wrote on Wednesday of the first week, "Worked with teacher on February Bulletin Board when class went to P.E....Wonder if children should do more bulletin board work. Professional pride in keeping the room tidy and sharp is motivation of teacher... While pupils did individual work in morning, teacher and I put up pictures...seems as though some of this busy work could be done before school. This takes time away from individual help."

The characteristic information flow in the dyad and its usual direction seen in the other logs is present in Carol's too. On the last day of her first week she wrote, "Talked with teacher about her philosophy on seating arrangement: she seats pupils together who won't disturb each other. She changes seating when necessary." The context of this day indicates, "when necessary" means "when pupils talk to one another." In Carol's log too, the dyad may be seen to govern her movement into the teaching set. On Monday of the second week she reported, "I was told to take over the last (reading) group--brightest group." Her regular participation in the teaching set began in the fourth week, "Teacher had me lead...slowest group...I will prepare reading lessons from now on--as suggested."

---

[1] In passing we might note Carol will label them, not to the children but for her log.

We have an illustration of the nature of one aspect of the cooperating teacher's role in the teaching set in Carol's fifth week. "...Often in my reading groups pupils don't pay attention...some looking around. Teacher pointed this out to me...Teacher suggests sending pupils back to their seats (one of them) who talk or distract during the class reading group."[1] Mrs. Callahan and the other cooperating teachers seen in the logs participate in the teaching set as a source for feed-back on the student teacher's performance. They are also evaluators of that performance. Frequently the comments of the cooperating teachers in relation to the teaching set resemble the one quoted above. They help the student teacher note pupil inattention or disruptive behavior. Advice on how to overcome this class of problems usually takes two interdependent forms: tighter control of pupil behavior and simplifying the planned learning.

Decreasing the amount to be learned. What this means for the development of the student teacher's perspective may be illustrated by examining Carol's development in her last three weeks of student teaching. In the eleventh week, nearing the end of student teaching, Carol taught a science lesson on flowers. She was dismayed by the performance of her second graders on a test she made up and gave at the end of that lesson. The class averaged fewer than seventy per cent correct answers on the material covered by Carol and the text. Before beginning her twelfth week unit on insects she turned to Mrs. Callahan. "I asked my cooperating teacher for criticisms, I received two helpful suggestions:

1. I should be less lengthy in illustrations and particularly in lesson discussion.

2. When we are studying things...pupils want to tell their experiences--or even their cousin's experiences! This must be cut off unless particularly appropriate." On the following day, Carol "cut down"[2] the lesson in science successfully. "Too much 'new' material seemed to be presented in the text at once. The children did not grasp it all. Less could have been covered in this one day." She simplified the lesson on insects by

---

[1] See similar advice to Betty, pp. 45, 46.

[2] Her phrase.

confining herself to teaching the children that an insect has a head, a thorax and an abdomen. On this test she reported, "nearly everyone got 100%." In her thirteenth and last week Carol wrote, "I realize more and more the importance of having a simple and specific aim for each lesson. Children need direction in looking for 'what is important' in a lesson... This can only be done if the teacher emphasizes certain learnings and is brief with the subordinate ones. From this practice, the pupils should, later on, be able to select the important points of a lesson. (This would come in fourth grade.)" Carol learned to focus on the immediate day's lesson and to reduce her expectations for pupil learning.

Tighter control of pupil behavior. The typical criticism by cooperating teachers which appears repeatedly in the logs is that the student teacher needs to control the pupils' behavior more than they do in the teaching set. In her log between the fourth and ninth weeks Carol repeats, "I must be confident and firm." During the sixth week, reporting from the teaching set, she writes, "My weak point in the lesson was the spelling bee which we had. Several pupils tried to change the rules when they noticed a hesitation in my presentation. I made several changes in procedures as we went along since the group was getting so noisy. If I had thought it through more carefully beforehand, it would have been more effective." The lesson is clear; she who hesitates may lose her class control. Just as simplified lessons and cutting off discussion work, so a plan carried out without hesitation prevents the class from getting noisy. During the tenth week she says, "Some children want to talk too long and too much about things that aren't relevant. I get tired of stopping such 'jabber' from the same few children." (In passing, we note that cutting the lesson to a few essentials is likely also to narrow the area of what is relevant and possibly increase the frequency of irrelevant things brought up by the pupils. The distance between the irritation expressed here and verbal attack on the pupil is not great.)

In summary, Carol's few expressions of doubt concerning Mrs. Callahan's operations occurred in the first half of the semester when the latter lost her temper with the children. Her own experience in the teaching set was paralleled by fear that she too would develop a "resentment"[1] for pupils who are annoying. Statements such as the following tenth week one appear increasingly during her last four weeks. "It is easier to be tolerant as a student teacher for one semester than to have to deal with certain behavior problems as a full-time teacher all year. I wonder how much less tolerant I will become when this (latter) is my role? I hope little." Similarly in the eleventh week she writes, "The teacher spoke of Jamie as 'hopeless' (and several others, too.) A young, still idealistic teacher like myself, rarely feels that any child is 'hopeless' as far as future potential is concerned. Maybe after I teach for a year I will change!--Yet I hope not." But in the twelfth week her log suggests she may be a little nearer to following Mrs. Callahan's example. "The teacher was very angry and told him he must learn to pay attention! She tore up his paper and made him begin again. Sometimes temper proves effective but I hesitate to use it myself."

---

[1] Her term.

While the dyadic relationship never becomes characterized by "we" in Carol's writing, evidence of acceptance as a teacher was given her by Mrs. Callahan. In her eighth week, she wrote, "Mrs. Callahan reminded me to order the Scott Foresman complimentary calendar, since I will be using their texts next year."[1] Her last entry in her log also contains elements of incorporation as well as a summary of her new perspective. She wrote, "My most ineffective classroom control has come when I was tired and irritated by the excessive demands of pupils... I was eager to receive some type of evaluation from my cooperating teacher. Little improvements were pointed out...the most significant comment my cooperating teacher made was that from observing my work in the classroom, she felt I might be more suited for fourth than third. I have a tendency to spend too much time on materials and go over the children's heads at times. My contract for next year says either third or fourth. If I am assigned a fourth grade, it might be better. However, if I teach third grade, I must simplify my class instruction... As my cooperating teacher reminded me, 'Don't be afraid to ask questions as a starting teacher' -- I'm sure that I'll be asking many as I face the unique challenges of my classroom next year."[2] The older teachers will probably be quite willing, as Mrs. Callahan suggested, to help Carol feel less uncomfortable about becoming irritated with the children's demands on her.

Learning, as Betty's case illustrated, to move through the planned day, to keep the children moving and to curtail discussion will beat the clock. The teaching schedule can be met. But, as Carol learned through experience in the teaching set,[3] pupil performance on tests covering the lesson may be dismal. The problematic situation for the student teacher in the teaching set involves more than just beating the clock. She must learn that and still have evidence that the pupils learn. This problem Carol solved with the advice given her in the dyad.[4] She can avoid her "...tendency to spend too much time on materials and go over the children's heads at times..." by under-estimating the children's capacity to learn and simplifying the lessons. The cooperating teachers' advice for beating the clock by moving through the lessons on schedule and simplifying them works. Carol also found that the more simple her lessons and tests, the higher the pupils' grades on them.

---

[1] She was under contract earlier than most student teachers.

[2] Note the self image implicit in her underscored my.

[3] P. 50.

[4] Pp. 50, 51.

Donna: Coercion Works

Donna did her student teaching in a suburban middle-class fourth grade classroom of twenty-three children whom she described as "....slow at catching on, under their achievement level, very immature for the fourth grade..."[1] She began observing Mrs. Douglas two weeks before the University's semester started and her log's first entry concerns the Monday of her third week in that classroom.

Donna's log presents us with the characteristic dyadic change in social distance. She shifted from "Mrs. Douglas and I" to "we" during the first half of the semester and used Mrs. Douglas' first name, Nina, often in the second half of the semester.

The evidence in the log concerning an increase of Mrs. Douglas' influence over Donna as the social distance decreased is less certain. (There is no record of Donna's first two weeks.) We do note that Donna indicated concern for Mrs. Douglas' pattern of excluding from the group pupils who act up as late as her fifth week of student teaching.[2] Wednesday of that week her log reads, "Mrs. Douglas had moved Davie in the back of the room and John in front for misbehaving. John looked pretty down in the dumps so I asked him to help me close the windows. He was more than happy to help--I'm not sure if I did the right thing." On the next day she writes, "Today Davie was moved in the back of the room again for not following directions. - He had tears in his eyes. - The lesson was on directions, N.S.E.W. Mrs. Douglas asked him again but he was mixed up - I think this was due to his being moved in the back and probably he was a little scared." On Thursday of her log's fifth week we read, "Nina gave a test... I wonder if perhaps it might have been good to go over the answers after the test. - We didn't - but I think we should have." In contrast, her log on Wednesday of her last week reads, "Nina told me if the reading group gave me trouble to send out students who were noisy--so I ended up sending out Teddy, Sam and John. She said after a few times the class will be quieter. They wanted to know if they could come back into their own group and I told them they must promise to be better citizens and do some extra work on what they missed - they agreed." Thursday's entry says, "John and Dick gave me trouble so I told them to leave. They both asked for a second chance and I gave it to them and from then on they were quiet. Sam also acted silly and I moved him. Then he refused to take part so I ignored him and he finally participated."

Covering the material by moving through a planned lesson rapidly and by simplifying the lesson requires control of pupil behavior. Donna's log helps us to see the element of controlling pupil behavior as part of the student teacher's new perspective. Her log's first entry includes the following:[1] "Mrs. Douglas told them at the end of the period that they must be quieter so others can work and that if they couldn't clean up faster they wouldn't be able to work in committees. Need to remind them about good citizenship." On the next day she writes, "Today the committees worked much quieter and improved on the amount of time to clean up - still slow though." During the following week, Donna reporting from the observer set, noted Davie's "tears" and John's looking "pretty down in the dumps." However, in the context of the teaching set that week she wrote,[2] I took charge of the 3-1 reading group of 4...[3] they were acting silly. Sue was the instigator so I sent her over in the corner until the rest had finished.reading. When she came back she was still silly. I think that some of the pupils think they can get by with more when I'm in charge. This is only natural with a new teacher, substitute or me.--I hope." Donna has told us that the technique of exclusion from the group, which her cooperating teacher used to control pupil behavior in class was the one she also used. Mrs. Douglas functioned as a model for Donna in this respect at least. In a similar way Miss Adams was a model for Alice. For example, on Thursday of her sixth week Alice wrote, "Today I shook John Hudgins myself! (I had to - I see the point now!) I was so horrified at her doing it, but you must do something." On Monday of that week she had written, "Miss Adams shook John Hudgins today. I was horrified."

---

[1] The particular school district personnel talk about an 115 I.Q. as an average pupil in that district.

[2] This was her log's third week. Reference to weeks which follow mean log weeks. Thus in Donna's case a twelfth week entry concerns her fourteenth week of student teaching.

Her cooperating teacher also helped Donna with classroom control directly. She reminded the children in a general way about keeping order. Donna's last entry of the third week reads in part, "The class was reminded again about good citizenship in the halls; about interrupting without raising your hand and about getting off to a different subject when called on; and about following directions and how this will help them learn. They are very slow at grasping the above..." Mrs. Douglas' specific support of Donna in her teaching set may be seen at the beginning of the fourth week. "Nina told the class that when I'm in charge my word goes-we (Nina and I) had discussed this before and they seemed to pay more attention to me than before."

---

[1] The children were engaged in committee work in social studies.

[2] With one exception, between this point and the seventh week Donna continued in the observer set and the teaching set with groups of children. She was first given "the class" as a whole briefly near the end of the sixth week and reports, "Today I read a chapter of a story...to the class. I had no idea I was going to...and I was a little scared. I talked kind of fast but I held the class's attention and no-one got up and went to the waste can. (They have done this when Nina reads.)"

[3] This was the poorest of three reading groups in Mrs. Douglas' fourth grade class of "slow" pupils. They completed the 3-1 book October 17th.

Mrs. Douglas used other techniques such as threatening to withhold an activity the children liked if they were not quiet enough.[1] This is seen again on Monday of the fourth week, "The class was noisy this afternoon and wanted to know when they could see films - they were told that unless they followed instructions and behaved better, they could not see films." On the following day the log begins, "The class was much quieter today because they wanted to see the film they were denied yesterday." On Wednesday we read, "...there was only 20 minutes left so Nina took a democratic vote on whether to have music or math. Of course music won unanimously, but after ten minutes they were so noisy that the privilege was taken away and math was taught." Since there were parent conferences scheduled for Friday when a substitute teacher would take the class, they continued with math on Thursday. Donna wrote, "Sam left his math book at home and had to look on someone else's. I would have given him mine but Nina said a little discomfort will help him to remember to bring his--I think she's right." She also reported, "Nina puts a child's name on the board if he is bad and if he continues she puts a mark next to it. If you have a mark after your name - you must stay after school 5 minutes, 10 minutes for two marks, etc."

Donna understood that Mrs. Douglas did not like punishing children. As she wrote, "I was talking to Nina and she said she just hates herself when she has to use harsh discipline (sending a child out of the room, keeping after school, moving desks in back of room, etc.) but she said that in these cases it has to be. She said it works and therefore she has to do it." Similarly, in the sixth week, the class had begun working on a mural. On Wednesday Donna wrote, "Nina told the children they couldn't paint until they brought smocks from home. She said she hated to say that and almost gave in once or twice but she said they have to learn responsibility." She continues the next day, "Everyone except Mary had their smocks today so I think Nina used good judgment and foresight..." Donna's last entry of that week reads, "The whole class stayed 5 minutes after class because they were so noisy."[2]

Tuesday of her diary's seventh week was for her a red letter day. She entered the teaching set with the entire class to teach a lesson for the first time.[3] "I began my unit on forests today...I told Nina how I was going to organize it and she gave me some suggestions... The class seemed excited that I was going to teach and Nina told them to show their good manners... no-one gave me any trouble. This is pretty unusual ... Nina seemed pleased and said I did a great job--I was on cloud 9. She wished Mr. Deeds[4] could have been there to see me and I agree. I was a little worried until I got started--then I was all right." The next day "I continued on my unit and ran an experiment of having the class read silently. They had trouble reading and kept asking me what the words were. I had used these words before I had them read but they still had trouble. I didn't feel very confident today." Donna's experimental departure from Mrs. Douglas' pattern with the total class did not, it seems, take into account the demands for individual attention that resulted from it. But on the next day, "Mr. Deeds came to me today. The class seemed very attentive--they usually are when someone else is in the room."

---

[1] In this connection note her threat to stop committee work, above, p. 54.

[2] In passing we may note that they went to music that day.

[3] See footnote #2, p. 54.

[4] Donna's college supervisor.

Donna continued in the small reading group teaching set even after she moved into that involving the entire class. Her control of pupil behavior in the small group was not as yet complete. In the context of the reading group teaching set on Monday of the eighth week we read, "John was kicking Janie, and I asked him several times to sit in front of the room. So Nina came over, slapped him on the arm and told him to do what I said. After this he was much more settled in his work." But as we saw above,[1] John and others moved out when she asks them to in the twelfth week.

In the ninth week Donna introduced the class to French and continued this subject in the teaching set with the entire class. Her classroom control continued to improve and she noted getting help from Mrs. Douglas. The log on Monday of the eleventh week contains this: "I had to move Teddy in front of the room because he was busy talking and not working. He didn't work there either. He claimed he wasn't talking." On Tuesday it continues, "I had to send Teddy out because he was talking and move Sam in front because he was acting silly. Teddy was much better after I talked to him about disturbing others." On Wednesday, "...they turned into a bunch of wild Indians. They were silly and couldn't concentrate." Thursday, Donna wrote, "The freedom they have had (working on the mural) shows in their other work. They've been very silly." She introduced a new unit at the beginning of the twelfth week and brought in some new books. "Everyone made a dash for them; but I sent them all back and told them they had to finish the rest of the reading assignment first." The week ended as noted above.[1]

In Donna's case we have focused sharply upon the part that classroom control plays in the student teacher's developing perspective. But Mrs. Douglas also helped her to modify downward her expectations of pupil learning. Just as Alice, Betty and Carol learned to follow their cooperating teachers' patterns for teaching, so did Donna. They learned to get through the day's schedule by cutting their levels of expectation for pupil learning. Alice learned to "leave out the chords" and play slower in kindergarten. Betty was told to speed up the lesson and to ignore reading decimals in sixth grade. Carol learned that the text in third grade presents too much new material at once. Donna too learned to cut her expectations for pupil learning. After all, it was a "slow" class and Mrs. Douglas helped her readjust her level of expectations. In her tenth week she wrote, "I gave them an assignment which a majority of the class did wrong. Nina said this was par for the course."

---

[1] See p. 53.

In summary, what Donna learned is not only to withhold pleasant experiences when the pupils are noisy, move them up front or in back, send them out, put them in the corner and, when needed, slap a John on the arm. She also learned a criterion, expressed by Mrs. Douglas and reported by Donna, for evaluating teaching practices and teaching behavior." ...She just hates herself when she has to use harsh discipline .... it works, therefore, she has to do it." Donna did not say what it works for, but the answer is clear. What the teacher "has to do" because "it works" is that which gets her and the class through the activities planned for the given lesson, day, unit or week of work. It is the teacher's work, not the pupils' learning, that becomes the center of the student teacher's attention. Reducing pupil disruptive behavior and simplifying the learning to a few highly predictable outcomes per lesson increases the chances of beating the clock. Keeping the teaching show on the road becomes, logically, an end in itself for the student teacher. Those children who fall behind are dealt with by reclassifying them as slow or immature.[1] Once they are so classified, they may receive special attention off the playing field so to speak, but they are not allowed to slow down the progress of the teacher through the lesson plan.

Ellen: "It works"

In Ellen's case, we will only touch upon the dyad's development along its characteristic lines. By the sixth week it had become a "we" dyad and the joint responsibility for the complex operation of the classroom appeared. "During gym, Mrs. Eton and I planned the rest of the week's work." On Wednesday of that week we read, "Mrs. Eton and I had planned carefully for the afternoon, but our plan didn't work." The dyad as a mechanism for calling the teaching interaction act into existence and for controlling the student teacher's behavior in terms of which set she will be in, for how long, etc., is seen in Ellen's report of her second week. "Mrs. Eton suggested I might wait and observe another day before she would give me a definite assignment." And in the fifth week, "Today was the dreaded day, as the college supervisor was coming to observe me....Mrs. Eton had planned to let me teach the entire afternoon."

Ellen's log indicates a pattern of advice in the dyad similar to those previously noted: advice concerning classroom control, especially on how to reduce disruptive behavior and advice on how to get through the lesson, advice which, in Ellen's case too, involved a reduction in her expectations of what the children could learn. During the sixth week, disussing the results of a reading lesson she gave, Ellen said, "I was pleased with the results in general but when I began to ask questions not covered by the book questions,[1] the children couldn't answer. Mrs. Eton said that, they are just slow and don't comprehend ideas for themselves unless guided." Later she reported, "I just had them read the answers after I had asked the question, this time they all got the correct answers."

---

[1] Note Betty, above, p. 45.

As for classroom management, Ellen told how (during an art lesson she was teaching with Mrs. Eton absent from the room) "David finally did too much and I marched him out into the hall just as Mrs. Eton and Mr. Elkins,[2] were coming up the hall. When I saw them I wished that I would have left David in the room, but it was now too late, so I went back and resumed class. This time they were quiet as mice...When Mrs. Eton came back, she said Mr. Elkins was happy to see that I was taking over with discipline, because this is where most of the student teachers are failing." In her twelfth week she writes, "what a day...they were little...monsters... Mrs. Eton told me they had been rowdy all day. She had thought it was just her...but since they were the same with me also she knew it was them...[3] I learned a great deal from this afternoon by observing the clever way Mrs. Eton handled these prolonged discipline problems... They had to have notes telling their parents they had been bad signed and brought back with an apology to me. We both hope this will work...or there will be a little trip made to the office. Mr. Elkins wouldn't care and it would solve the problem."

Here it is obvious "the problem" for Ellen which will be solved is the problem of disruption of the classroom. In the tenth week Betty wrote, "When I went by and talked to each child, Mr. Brown said it was very good as it does wonders for class control and is good motivation." According to him, Betty's considerate behavior was good not in itself but as it contributed to classroom control and management! Again the yardstick which distinguished good from bad behavior, and children who are behavior problems from those who are not, was divorced from the child's psychological realm. It was the classroom organizational realm and the need to keep the show on the road which defined a problem child for Ellen. Giving the children the questions first, then reading, then examining them only on those questions, produced successful feedback on the lessons.

---

[1] Underscore ours.

[2] The principal.

[3] Note the accolade of implied incorporation.

She also found that taking David out of the room made the children "quiet as mice." Both helped her meet the ultimate criterion, keeping the teaching activity going. All five of our student teachers had this impressed upon them.

The test for what techniques are good in teaching follows from this--"it works." Put in Ellen's words, "We both hope this will work or there will be a little trip made to the office." The answer, Ellen tells us, to behavior which threatens the progress of the lesson, if the increase of pressure called for from the parents does not work, will be an increase in the institutional pressures to conform. The answer to poor feedback is simplifying the lesson. The teaching task of covering the materials is simplified by narrowly specifying what will be learned and looking for rote repetition of a few facts or processes fed back by the pupil. This may not, almost certainly does not, enhance learning. Those children who do not feed back acceptably but who are not "behavior problems," also threaten the juggernaut of teaching. These are dismissed as "slow" and, as defined by the criterion of keeping the teaching activity going to the next lesson on schedule, they are slow. This definition of slow is better than a psychologist's test. It is circular and therefore unfailing. Its strength lies in its utility in the teaching situation. Once such children can be categorized, their progress is no longer a useful measure of the teacher's progress.

The student teacher in the teaching set must deal with the difficulties involved in getting the class through the lessons and units on time. This virtually requires that she find some ways of eliminating disruptive behavior and simplifying the lessons. The evaluation and advice she gets in the dyad helps her find a solution to her difficulties. Success in the teaching set tends to be concurrent with changes in the dyad. It also is tangibly evident in pupil behavior as she gains control of the teaching set.[1] Any doubt she may have had about the advice or example of the cooperating teacher tends to be laid at rest by the customary test, it works.

The next chapter will concentrate on the characteristic new perspective developed by the student teacher. The social structure to which we will give primary attention is the teaching set rather than the dyad.

---

[1] We should hardly be surprised if her anxiety was reduced and self image as a teacher enhanced in this process as indicated above, pp. 25-29.

CHAPTER 5

THE TEACHING SET: SOCIAL STRUCTURE OF INCORPORATION

Just as the observer set reflects the college student status and the dyad is unique to student teaching, so the teaching set gives the student teacher her opportunity to behave as a teacher. The teaching set is, thus, the social structure of incorporation. It presents the student teacher with the kinds of difficulties she will face in future years as a teacher with her own class, and requires her to cope with them. Success in overcoming these difficulties results in a reduction of anxiety and a change in her self image to that of teacher. But that success is bought at a price. The typical combination of difficulties which the student teacher meets in the teaching set creates a major problematic situation for her. The perspective concerning teaching--what it is and how it is done--which she brings into the student teaching experience from college does not work to solve the problematic situation she faces in the teaching set. A new perspective which she develops with the combined help of the flow of information, evaluation and advice in the dyad, and the example of her cooperating teacher does work to solve the problematic situation she faces in the teaching set.

In this chapter we examine the logs of three student teachers. Faye, our first case, was typical and illustrates the development of the new perspective. Janice and Sarah were deviants. The one began her student teaching with the new perspective already fully developed, but Sarah never acquired it. Unlike the five cases we reported in the previous chapter, these three were not chosen at random from the twenty-five logs used in the study. Faye was one of the twenty-five. Her log was selected for this portion of the report for two reasons. She entered the teaching set early and her log is dominated by it. Faye was, in addition, more introspective than most of our twenty-five. Janice's log is different from the others and warrants special attention. Finally, Sarah was not one of our twenty-five. We had been alerted to the fact that she was, to quote her college supervisor, "in trouble" before the end of her student teaching. One of the principal investigators in this study intervened and probably influenced the course of events markedly in her last month of student teaching. Because of this we did not include her in the study. But the nature of her deviancy from the others helps illustrate the general pattern. Consequently, her log too seems worth including in this Chapter.

FAYE: Developing the New Perspective

Faye did her student teaching in a middle-class, suburban, fourth grade classroom. By February, when Faye went into student teaching, Mrs. Fisher had the class well in hand. Faye was not faced with a particularly difficult classroom management situation. Faye entered the teaching set briefly in her first week and more extensively in her second week. Thus, the teaching set provided the context for most of the entries in her log. Her log indicates the combination of factors in the elementary classroom teacher's world which created the problematic situation faced by Faye and our other student teachers. It also illustrates the student teacher's new perspective and how Faye developed it in student teaching.

Time and the Schedule. Faye's first entry was written with the observer set as its context. "Observed classroom activities in morning. Amazed at rigid schedule that is kept up throughout the day. Seems they just start a certain subject and when interest is achieved, they start something else. I am unable to see how children learn anything." This entry indicates that Faye's experience on this first day as an observer provided her with something in the nature of a surprise. Her word to describe her reaction is "amazed." The activities she observed were perceived by her as organized into a rigid schedule. Her statements, moreover, indicate that she did not recognize the function of that schedule as helping to get the teacher through her day's work on time. With her college student perspective, time did not constitute an element in a problematic situation for her. Nor did Faye, at this stage, make the assumption that getting through the schedule meant that the pupils had learned. Instead, her perception was that the rigid schedule cut off the development of a subject at the point where the pupils give indications of being interested.

Mrs. Fisher moved Faye into the teaching set later in that first week by having her give the class their spelling tests. Faye concluded her first week's log with the following statement: "As the week progressed, I understood the need for the rigid schedule; it is necessary to accomplish anything and to hold the attention of the children." The schedule which had been perceived as cutting off a subject too early was later seen by Faye as "necessary to accomplish anything." Time, the need to beat the clock, as in Betty's case,[1] had begun to become an element in the situation Faye was confronted with as a student teacher.

Faye's next reference to the problem of time and the schedule was made in her sixth week. She had by then been a participant in the teaching set more or less regularly for five weeks. She had taught a series of lessons on book reviews and a second unit on movie reviews. The entries in her log indicate she had increasing success at dealing with the problematic situation in the teaching set. Having completed the unit on movie reviews, during the fifth week she continued to teach language lessons relying at this point heavily upon the sequence of lessons in their text book. But an unexpected event at the end of the fifth week presented Faye with a difficulty.

---

[1] See pp. 44-49, especially p. 48.

She wrote at the beginning of the sixth week, "The snow last week disrupted my planned schedule for language, as we had to make up with two lessons in one day. But it worked out well in spite of my worries. We did a review very quickly orally and the other lesson with a written exercise." What Faye first saw as a "rigid schedule" which raised questions as to "how the children learn anything," was later seen by her as "necessary to accomplish anything." By her sixth week, it had become, "my planned schedule for language." The disruption of her schedule by a snowfall worried her, she said. The classroom teacher's difficulty of never having enough time was, for Faye, aggravated by the loss of a day. What Faye saw, as demanded by the situation resulting from the snowfall, was the need "to make up" time.[1] By now, she had learned through her experience in the teaching set to pay attention to time and to deal with it by means of her planned schedule. Further, she had learned enough to solve the problem posed by an unexpected disruption of that schedule. In passing, we may note that her solution required an assumption she had not been ready to make her first day: getting through the lesson implies pupil learning.

The problem posed by limited time is present throughout student teaching. Faye's log in its second to the last week reads, "My schedule was upset by the arrival of the bookmobile, but I changed the pace of my lessons and completed everything. But at the end of the day, I had to rush through language to complete an art lesson. In art, I asked them to fold paper and make spring flowers. In order to do this, they had to follow my directions carefully. Because of the lack of time, I rushed my instructions, and the children were not too successful in following them." One slight difference between this entry and her sixth week entry lies in what she now meant by the schedule. Then, it was her schedule for language which was the only subject she had regularly taught. Now, instead, her schedule was one involving the whole day's work. She was responsible for the entire range of subjects when the bookmobile upset her schedule.

Faye had come full circle. The problem posed for the teacher by limited time which she did not really see her first day of student teaching was with her to the end. She had, however, come to understand precisely that schedule which bewildered her on her first day. Time, which Faye could not control, she, in effect, operationally redefined as the schedule. This she could control and so make up time.

---

[1] This expression is interesting. "Making up time" is a fiction in itself.

The Universe of Learning and the Planned Lessons. While it is possible to conceptually disassociate time from the number of different pupils in an elementary class and the amount of learning expected of them, phenomenologically, they exist in combination for the classroom teacher. If time constitutes a major element of the problematic situation facing the student teacher, it does so only in relationship to other major elements in the situation. Just as a difficulty with time became operationally defined by Faye as a difficulty with the schedule, so the learning expected of pupils became operationally defined as their progress through specific lessons. However conceptually distinct these two redefinitions may remain for the researchers, they occurred behaviorally in tandem for Faye.

The student teacher's conceptual organization of the universe of what is to be taught and learned is illustrated by Faye's log entries. That universe is first divided into subjects. Faye, who had been teaching the language arts, moved into a new teaching set with social studies in her seventh week. "I had expected to continue with language, but she (Mrs. Fisher) changed her mind in order to give me as varied an experience as possible. The prospect of starting a new subject was not a joyous one to me, as I was beginning to feel rather secure in a routine. . ." A subject such as language or social studies is often sub-divided into units. Thus Faye, reporting on her new teaching venture the following week, wrote, "I started the social studies unit on famous men." Similarly, language has been sub-divided into units on book reviews and movie reviews. A unit is further sub-divided into lessons. Thus, Faye, in her third week, "began the language unit on book reviews." At the end of that week she wrote, "Language lessons are becoming better. . ." Faye saw a unit as beginning on a given day, continuing through its sequentially organized parts, daily lessons, and ending on a specific day. At the end of her seventh week, she concluded, "The language lessons went relatively well all week. . . Friday, I gave them a unit test in language."

Lessons, too, may be viewed in terms of their components. Faye stated it briefly in her second from the last week, "I continued with the middle reading group, which consists of introducing the story, making the assignment, and correcting the workbook." The elementary student teacher's universe of what is to be taught and learned is separated into subjects which are most often divided into units and further broken down into daily lessons. These in turn are often seen as sub-divided into the presentation of information and the giving of instructions by the teacher which are followed by pupil activities pursuant to those instructions and some checking or feedback on the pupils' work.

The student teachers in our study had been taught how to develop a unit and how to make lesson plans. They had been taught to relate the purpose of each lesson to the purposes of the unit. But only with student teaching and with participation in the teaching set did they have the experience of trying to put their plans into operation. In that operation, the units became linked to a master schedule of days, the lessons became tied to a schedule of real clock hours and the planned activities within a lesson, a matter of vital minutes. Whatever difficulties Faye may have faced drawing up lesson plans for her college instructors, they were not the same as the difficulties she faced in the teaching set. Thus, after seven weeks of experience in the teaching set, Faye wrote, "In spite of the fact that I write a main purpose on paper, I'm unable to stick to it and often seem to come around aimlessly from one detail to another without too much continuity."

The specific difficulties Faye reported in getting through the scheduled lessons may help to illustrate one aspect of the problematic situation as faced by the student teacher in the teaching set. Mrs. Fisher had helped Faye get accustomed to the teaching set in her first week. On her third day Faye wrote, "I gave a trial spelling test, got in front of the class for the first time. Felt ill at ease." On the next day, however, "I gave spelling dictation, felt somewhat better in front of class. Children now seem to expect me to give them their spelling." But her newly found confidence was shaken when Mrs. Fisher gave her a unit on book reviews in language to begin the next week. "I was surprised she gave me this unit and felt unprepared to start teaching this much so soon." Mrs. Fisher allowed Faye to set up her plan for a unit and try it out. Characteristically for the beginning student teacher, it was too ambitious. The Fomest School did not have a library. "Therefore," said Faye, "I borrowed twenty-six books from various libraries."

Faye reported the unit's beginning. "I began the language unit on book reviews. Discussed with class what book reviews are. Children, for the most part, eager to participate in class discussions." Faye had attempted to get the children to understand book reviews. She did not prescribe in detail what they should put in their reviews nor did she use the blackboard to outline a model book review for them. However satisfying the discussions on book reviews, Faye's failure to make her plans and expectations for the children sufficiently clear, detailed, and simple presented her with difficulties. As she began to deal with these, she wrote at the end of that week, "Language lessons are becoming better as the children begin to know my expectations and, more important, as I plan the lesson more carefully. I am beginning to understand the need for detailed planning before introducing anything to the class. . . Often I doubt if I will ever become a good teacher." It may be unnecessary to add that Faye had been told repeatedly in her education program about the need to plan carefully. Nevertheless, her experience in the teaching set led to her saying, "I am beginning to understand. . ."

In her fourth week, she wrote concerning an art lesson on covers for the reviews, "My poor instructions showed up in the results. Few of the children really understood what I wanted them to do. I took too much for granted and should have explained and planned the lesson more carefully." On Monday of her fifth week, Faye continued with the same problem, ". . .as usual, I took too much for granted. . . I fail so often to explain things fully. . ."

Faye moved from the unit on book reviews to one on movies. Her experience this time was better. She avoided her earlier difficulties by specifying in detail what the pupils should put in their reviews. "I asked the class what they thought should be in a book review, and I listed these things on the board. I asked them to write their movie reviews accordingly. They understood much better what I wanted and what should be in a review." The movie reviews took less than half the time of the book reviews.

Faye's third unit in language went even better. It neither involved chasing down twenty-six books from various libraries nor the lack of simple, clear instructions. She followed the language textbook closely. "The language lessons went relatively well all week as I became more accustomed to the book, the lessons, and children. Also, the lessons were so well defined in the book that the children could easily understand them."

The difficulties Faye faced in putting her lesson plans to work were similar to those noted earlier with Carol and others.[1] As was the case with the others, Faye learned to redefine learning goals as the goals of planned lessons. By successive approximations, she reduced her expectations concerning the children's learning in the subject of language to a few precise and predetermined types of pupil behavior to be fed back to her. In the process, she modified the children's learning to the current performance level of the class. It was at this point that Mrs. Fisher changed her plans for Faye and moved her into a new teaching set with the unit on social studies.[2] In this new subject, Faye was again overly ambitious. Mrs. Fisher allowed her to try and set up committees to report on different famous men.

Faye was then plagued by several difficulties she had not anticipated. "I asked the class if they would like to work in committees to make notebooks and reports. They chose which man they would like to work on." As at the start of language units, Faye's instructions were not sufficiently simple, detailed, and clear. A few days later she wrote, "Daily, I find flaws in my presentation as the children never know what I expect." In addition, the first children to report were a disappointment. One result of allowing the children to select their men without influencing their choice enough was a problem Faye had not anticipated. "The two poorest students chose the first man and had less time than the others to prepare their report." In addition, the committee meetings ". . . were particularly noisy. I didn't," wrote Faye, "expect this and didn't know how to handle the situation."

---

[1] Pp. 50, 51.

[2] P. 63.

By the following week, Faye had cut the noise down, abbreviated the committee tasks and time allotted to these. She also changed her plans for the unit and lectured on social studies a larger proportion of the time than she had initially planned. After the committee reports were concluded, Faye stayed closer to the social studies text and at the end of her second to the last week wrote, "Social studies went relatively well all week, and my control of the class is improving. Or, perhaps, my control of myself in the teaching situation is improving." This was the same week in which she had written, "My schedule was upset. . . but I changed the pace. . . and completed everything."[1] Faye's sense of control and well being was related to her having successfully put her lesson plans into operation. Her measure of success was having "completed everything" even though her "schedule was upset." Completing everything--and implicit in that is completing everything on time--may require compensating for a snowfall by doing "a review very quickly orally and the other lesson with a written exercise,"[2] but it is evidence of being in control. Two elements of the problem solved this way are limited time and a large universe of what is to be taught and learned.

The Children and Classroom Control. Given Faye's operational definition of the universe to be taught and learned as consisting of subjects, units, and lessons with their component planned activities of teacher and pupils, it follows that her moving pupils through those planned activities became her operational definition of teaching. With the additional restriction of limited time, moving pupils through the scheduled lessons on time became her measure of success at teaching. The larger the number of children, and the greater the learning differences among them and the more attention the student teacher must give to their individual differences, the less probable will be her success at teaching so defined. Faye and her fellow student teachers in this study had been college students in an educational program which stressed the importance of individual differences in learning and which placed a high value on teachers' working with individual pupils. The situation within which she found herself in the teaching set was hardly consistent with the college program. Going into student teaching not only changed her position in terms of social structure, but also, it presented her with problems which were different from those she had been accustomed to solving as a college student.

Just as time and the universe to be taught became the schedule and the lessons for Faye, so, the children became the class. Thus, Faye used the term, the children, fifteen times and the term, the class, four times in her log entries during her first four weeks of student teaching. In contrast, the children appeared eight times and the class nine times in her log's last four weeks. However difficult it may be objectively to work remedially with individual pupils, the difficulties experienced and reported by the student teachers were primarily in working with a reading group or a total class.

---

[1] P. 62.

[2] P. 62.

It is instructive to note the extent to which Faye's log revealed her as having problems working with an individual pupil as distinct from her reading groups or the class. The difference between the nature of her difficulties in the one instance as opposed to the other is also important in understanding the part which the number of children plays in creating the problematic situation for the student teacher.

Faye reported her work with an individual pupil, Mary, who was assigned to her by Mrs. Fisher in her fourth week. "I began working with a girl who is reading on a low third grade level. I helped her with her reading while other reading groups are meeting. I enjoy this work with individuals much more than with the whole class." Later she wrote, "Continued work. . . in reading with my poor reader." At only one point did Faye indicate difficulty in this work. Near the close of her sixth week she wrote, "Throughout the week, I have been working with Mary, a very slow reader. I meet with her daily in the morning, correct her workbook, and let her read to me. She tells me about the story I assigned the day before. I feel I have the time to devote to this child, if only I knew how to help her." Apparently, Faye felt good about working with Mary. The only difficulty she reported was her own lack of knowledge. She felt she had time to give to Mary, and she enjoyed this in contrast explicitly to teaching the entire class.

It must be borne in mind that Faye had been involved in the teaching set with the entire class almost from the start. Had this not been so, Faye would probably have been concerned with her lack of progress, as were those student teachers who moved late into the teaching set with the entire class. Note, for instance, what Genevieve wrote in her tenth week of student teaching. She had been working remedially with three children in reading. "I know," she wrote, "I shouldn't feel this way, but I am beginning to get very impatient with this group. At first, I found it to be extremely gratifying. But after working with these children every morning--for the whole morning, I can't help but get a little nervous. I don't feel that I'm a private tutor nor have I been trained to be a private tutor. I realize that there are slow learners in every classroom. This doesn't bother me. In fact, I don't mind working with them at all.[1] It's just that this is the only group of children I've worked with the past month, and it's very trying for me." Genevieve stated it as clearly as anyone could want. It was "gratifying" to work with three slow readers "at first." Further, she did not mind working with them, but she was impatient with the fact that she was not moving towards teaching the whole class. For the student teacher, working remedially with individual pupils is not teaching.

As noted above,[2] the student teachers characteristically measured their rate of progress in the early part of the semester by when and to what extent they moved out of the observer set into the teaching set. They assessed their progress through the later portion of student teaching in a similar way. It was the total amount of time they spent in the teaching set each week and their movement through different teaching sets which provided them with cues concerning their progress in the late phase of student teaching. That movement may be described in two ways. They moved from a teaching set concerned with one subject, to one involving a second subject and to days when they taught several subjects. So Faye moved from language to social studies and then to all of the subjects in a single day.[1] The logs indicated that this progress was generally parallel to a second pattern of movement through teaching sets. This involved changes in the other participants in the teaching set, specifically, the number taught. The student teachers most often began working with an individual pupil or a few pupils whom their cooperating teacher felt needed special attention. They next participated in a teaching set with a group of children, most often in reading. They then took over the entire class. They seldom used the word teaching to denote their participation in an interaction set unless it involved the entire class.

---

[1] As pointed out elsewhere, the progress of the "slow" child is not treated as a measure of the teacher's progress through the lessons. Pp. 57,

[2] P. 38.

A high point in their progress was the first day on which they were allowed to take over the entire class for the whole morning or day. So Faye wrote in her eleventh week, "Monday: I taught all day. I really enjoyed this opportunity to get an over-all view of the entire school day.[2] Mrs. Fisher took a back seat and let me fumble through the day as best I could. The children accepted this change of teacher unquestioningly. . . In general, I felt pretty good about the whole day. I felt in control of the situation. I felt as though the class were my own and I could do as I pleased (within limits) rather than borrowing the class for a half hour lesson. I felt so in control of the situation that it didn't unnerve me when other teachers and even the principal stopped in the room to see Mrs. Fisher." With this characteristic pattern of experience in the student teacher's progress, it is not surprising that Faye focused increasingly upon the class rather than the children.

Faye's difficulties with a reading group were characteristic of those described by the other student teachers and more similar in nature to her difficulties with the total class then to anything she had expressed in connection with Mary. "My reading group," she wrote in her ninth week, "was well in hand last week. . . but this week they seem to have conspired behind my back to make chaos. They seem to be trying me and I still have not completely won the battle. The outcome of this reading group will be very interesting to my experience in practice teaching. The reading group seems to be out to make or break me as a teacher."

---

[1] Pp. 64-66, especially p. 65.

[2] In passing we note that while she had spent ten weeks in observation and in various teaching sets, only with this experience did she feel that she got an "overall view of the entire school day."

Her view of this situation was much different from that which an educational psychologist would see. The issue for Faye was not what the reading group would learn to read. It was caught up in the words "conspired behind my back." The issue was a "battle," the outcome of which could "make or break me as a teacher." The ultimate threat in the situation Faye faced with numbers of children was "chaos." The central difficulty faced by Faye in her reading group was one of management.

The circumstances involved in her difficulties with the total class were similarly those of management. Her repeated concern for more detailed instructions to the children was related to the combined difficulties of time, amount to be taught, and the number of children. The number of children in an elementary classroom would have given her a problem of management in any case; but this problem was greatly aggravated as she tried to manage the movement of the children through the planned lessons on schedule. In grappling with this problem, she saw the class more and individual children less. She measured her success in terms of the management of that class rather than pupil learning.

It is important to remember that Faye's first observation of the classroom's activities was evaluated by her with amazement as a "rigid schedule that is kept up throughout the day."[1] The expressed object of her concern at that time was the learning of the children. On her third day, she had, as reported above,[2] her first brief experience in the teaching set. "Felt ill at ease," she reported. It was better the next day but she was "surprised. . . to start teaching this much so soon,"[3] when Mrs. Fisher told her to take on her first language unit.[4] Soon she had come to see it was necessary "to hold the attention of the children," and the schedule did that.[5] On the day she began her first unit, before she realized that the children were not carrying out her plans well, she viewed the children's "eager (participation) in class discussion" favorably. The student teachers' logs, early in the experience, provided numerous instances in which active participation by pupils in discussion was treated by the student teachers as evidence of success. But, as Faye indicated,[6] the children did not respond as she had anticipated. Her directions were not detailed enough. Again, in her fourth week experience with the book covers,[1] she found the children did not respond as she had anticipated. In each of these instances in which Faye reported having difficulties, they were difficulties involving the management of the total class through her planned activities in the scheduled lessons.

---

[1] P. 61.

[2] P. 64.

[3] P. 64.

[4] In passing, we note Faye had expected this to come later in her progress.

[5] P. 61.

[6] P. 64.

The Redefined Problematic Situation. The experienced student teacher's redefinition of the problematic situation which Faye faced in the teaching set is most simply stated as one of managing the class so as to move it through the planned lessons on schedule. What she learned in order to do this and how she learned to do it was partly indicated above.[2] Her new perspective was based upon her redefinition of teaching. Her attitudes and behavior in relation to events which took place in the teaching situation were related to the meaning she attached to such events in terms of this new perspective.

One way of accomplishing her task was to simplify her directions and the lessons so the children could follow easily. In language she learned that it went better when she used the board and structured in detail what should go into a review. It went even better when she used the text for her lesson sequence and instructions. Similarly, in social studies when she became less ambitious and moved away from committee reports to lectures, the lessons went better. In summary, one facet of Faye's solution to the problem she faced in accomplishing her task, as defined above,[3] was to modify the children's learning task to the current performance level of the class.

It takes more than this modification with simple instructions to manage the progress of a room full of children through the schedule. As in the case of the other student teachers,[4] Faye learned to reduce the level of pupil demands upon her time, attention, and energy as well. In part, she accomplished this by modifying the learning task to the current performance level of the class. She accomplished this more directly by confining discussion and pupil initiated interaction with her to questions and comments which move the class toward the planned lesson. This may be seen in her experience with the committees she had set up in social studies.

Faye commented upon the unanticipated difficulties she met in that operation. "Tuesday, the first day of committee meetings, they were particularly noisy. I didn't expect this and did not know how to handle the situation." The following entry appeared on Wednesday: "I impressed upon the class the need for dividing committee work and working quietly. I also told them that when they get too noisy, I will stop the committee work for the day, which I had to do."[1] Her brief reference to the committee work on the next day was, "Committee work progressing better." On Friday, she wrote, "Committees are doing pretty well. . . some work rather aimlessly, although I gave them suggestions which I thought would go well."

---

[1] P. 64.

[2] Pp. 60-69.

[3] Pp. 69-70.

[4] Chapter 3 passim.

Her experiences and development with her book review unit were similar. She had been pleased at their eager participation on the day she introduced the unit. But by the beginning of the third week on it, Faye was concerned with the number of pupils coming to her rather than getting their reviews finished. She wrote on Monday, "I told the children to write book reviews. . . after I finished teaching and sat down, they then got out of their seats and showered questions at me." Precisely how she reduced the "shower" was not clear from her log, but on Tuesday she wrote, "They didn't run to ask questions, but set to work writing their reviews." Faye continued on Thursday, "Children did book reviews and were generally pretty good. They did the things I had asked them to do but I could tell they were not putting themselves into it. (Children asked questions afterwards of each other that they didn't really want to know.)" The pattern of ruling out discussion, noted earlier,[2] was followed by Faye too. This pattern may result in lowering pupil interest so that the committees work "aimlessly" or the reports get done, but the children do not put "themselves into it." Nonetheless, it does make it possible to get the teacher and class through the scheduled lessons. Put another way, cutting off discussion and questions which would redirect the pupils away from her planned lessons may be dysfunctional in terms of learning goals involving creativity, challenging the pupils, or shaping their behavior to a more complex or abstract level of understanding than they brought into the classroom in September. It is, however, functional for the student teacher faced with a situation which demands that she manage to get the class through the planned lessons on schedule.

The combined modification of the learning task to the current performance level of the class with the re-direction of pupil questions and discussion does not necessarily solve the problem of moving the class through the planned schedule. At times, some pupils get out of hand. These, Ellen dealt with by bringing to bear upon them increasing doses of institutionalized power to coerce them to conform to her managerial demands.[3] Donna found that force applied to these pupils worked to get the class through the schedule.[1] Carol, observing Mrs. Callahan, concluded that "sometimes temper proves effective."[2] Betty, reflecting Mr. Brown's influence, wrote "I should not be so tactful in telling a child he is lazy and should really make the point felt."[3] Alice exclaimed, "Today, I shook John Anderson myself! (I had to--I see the point now!) I was so horrified at her doing it, but you must do something."[4] Faye, too, learned to coerce pupils to conform to her managerial demands.

---

[1] Note the similar entry in Donna's log, pp. 53, 54.

[2] Above, Betty, p. 45, and Carol, pp. 49, 50.

[3] P. 59.

With her committees in social studies, she had noted they were "particularly noisy" and that she "didn't know how to handle the situation." She then used the expedient of stopping committee work when they got noisy, and this helped reduce the noise. Her concern for the noise the children made and Mrs. Fisher's influence on her in this connection is illustrated by an entry from the following week. She had been left with the class longer than she expected while Mrs. Fisher was out for a conference. Faye wrote, "She had said she would be back but didn't return. So I attempted to continue with the schedule and teach penmanship. Not knowing what Mrs. Fisher had planned, I was at a loss for what to do." Faye and the class engaged in writing on the board and critically evaluating one another's handwriting. This went off well. However, she continued, "The one thing that bothered me was that the children were noisy and I knew Mrs. Fisher would not like this. It wouldn't have bothered me in my own class, as they were not really being noisy just to be noisy but rather were reacting and being a little over enthusiastic." Up to this point, while Faye had become somewhat firmer in handling pupil behavior than at the start, she had not become angry with the children.

Until her "battle" with the reading group,[5] Faye's explanation of the reasons for having difficulties were almost exclusively stated in terms of her "poor instructions" or her lack of "detailed planning before introducing anything." *As she won the "make or break" experience with* the reading group, she began to use the word "control" to describe her feeling in the teaching situation. "My feeling," she wrote in the twelfth week, "of having authority in the classroom has continued through this week. Although, my control over the class and myself has been shaken." As the semester drew to a close and she demonstrated her ability to move the class through the schedule even in the face of interruptions, she wrote, "I find myself becoming increasingly short with the children.

---

[1] Pp. 56, 57.

[2] P. 52.

[3] P. 47.

[4] P. 54.

[5] Pp. 68, 69.

This is especially true when they speak out in discussion or ask pointless questions."[1]

In summary, the problematic situation as redefined by the student teacher and influenced by her experiences in the teaching set requires her to solve the problem of getting the class through the planned lessons on schedule. This, in terms of her new perspective, is a managerial problem. Her chances of solving it increase when she modifies the learning task to the current performance level of the class. In addition, her chances improve to the extent she confines discussion and questions to the sequence of activities planned for the lesson. Her odds are further enhanced when she can control the pupils' behavior and direct this towards the completion of the lesson. She can continue that progress, even in the face of nonconforming pupil behavior, by coercing those pupils.

The Deviants

The balance of this chapter will describe two student teachers whose logs did not display the characteristic patterns which the others did. Janice was one of our twenty-five cases. Sarah was not. She, however, was one of a group of student teachers who met with one of the researchers informally each Friday afternoon for coffee and conversation.[2] Her experiences particularly toward the end of her student teaching semester seemed unusual enough to warrant that her log be given special consideration.

The New Perspective from the Beginning. Janice did her student teaching in a third grade classroom in a suburban school district. One way in which her log differs from the others is in the sequence of the appearance of the observer and teaching sets in her writing. So on her fourth day, she wrote "I taught oral reading to the three groups while Mrs. Jones worked on their written work." Similarly, most of her log entries were written in the context of the teaching set until her sixth week, when the observer set, which appears on her first day and occasionally thereafter, begins to dominate her log. It is the context for most of Janice's entries in the last half of her student teaching semester. In addition, unlike the other logs, Janice's never gives indications of anxiety on her part with any aspect of her experience. At no point did she express a sense of dependency upon Mrs. Jones. For example, her second day's entry includes this statement: "We set up a plan to make insect cages." Related to this, was the use of "we" as early as the first week. More significant, perhaps, was the fact that almost from the start the relationship between Janice and Mrs. Jones seemed like a partnership of equals.

---

[1] Note the effect of redefining the area of relevant discussion, p. 51.

[2] P. 38.

As in the case of the general pattern, Janice too was sometimes critical of her cooperating teacher's operations. So, for instance, in her words, "Taught a complete art lesson. Mrs. Jones and I disagree on the looked-for results. She wants a perfect picture. I'm interested in the ability to express." But unlike the characteristic student teacher's pattern of progress through the semester, Janice did not later model her work in art on Mrs. Jones'. Neither did she accept her cooperating teacher's point of view. Nor did she express doubt concerning her own point of view when she criticized Mrs. Jones' operations. So she wrote in her last week, "I still question Mrs. Jones' philosophy of teaching art. . . . the work wasn't creative." Her criticisms of Mrs. Jones' teaching of social studies are similarly unchanging. In her seventh week she wrote, "Mrs. Jones gave the children a sheet of 21 questions about four pages of social studies. . . I think these are too many." On the following day she wrote, "The question sheet didn't go too well. . . Only about half finished the lessons. Mrs. Jones will review and catch up tomorrow. But I still think 21 questions were too many." The next week she continued her criticism of the number of questions used in the social studies assignments. "I'm still not convinced. . . No one finished today." During the third week of this pattern she reported, "After a week of work only four children out of 26 finished their questions on schedule. . . This group obviously isn't ready for this method. I'd quit and use another approach . . . I feel you have to adjust your methods to the ability of the group."

As the last sentence in her entry quoted above indicates, Janice did have the experienced student teacher's perspective. The fact that her criticisms did not decrease does not, however, mean that she emerged from student teaching without the characteristic perspective acquired by the other student teachers. Instead, Janice differed from the others in that her log displayed that perspective from its beginning. "You have to adjust your methods to the ability of the group." In her firth week she wrote, "Billy's questions are so immature. . . he needs to let everyone know he's still available." Even in her first week she had written, "Takes quite a while to get the children lined up in their written work. They can't think."

Janice viewed teaching largely as management from the start and thus shared the experienced student teacher's perspective from the first. She differed from the other student teachers in one other significant respect. Janice had taught without a certificate in a private elementary school for three years before returning to the college to complete the state requirements for her teaching certificate. One of these requirements was student teaching.[1]

---

[1] Since code names were used for the names of the student teachers in the analyses of their logs, the researchers did not become aware of this until after they had first identified Janice's log as deviant and gone back to the teacher certification records in an attempt to understand this case.

The Old Perspective to the End. Sarah began student teaching in September with Miss Schaefer's fifth grade in an upper middle-class elementary school. The observer set furnishes the context of her early log entries. At the end of the first week she summed up her experiences. "As I observed her class procedures and schedules I began to notice, and later she explained, her goals, how she handled the children and what some of her methods were. She was striving for listening, attention to directions--good habits. . . . I had already tried to use this goal with children. . . and was happy to hear that I had followed a procedure which was proper for this age level."[1] The typical information flow in the dyad is present in this entry. Sarah did see Miss Schaefer as her guide to ". . . a procedure which was proper. . . ." She noted the schedule but was also interested in Miss Schaefer's goals and conscious of the children's age level, which was not unusual at the early stage of student teaching.

In the second week she expressed her first criticism. At Miss Schaefer's direction, she had made up a chart with each child's name on it and movable flags by each name. If a child misbehaved, his flags were moved down on the chart. Writing on Friday of this second week, she said, "I feel that the chart is beneficial; however, the system as it stands is not the best. For the children are the checkers. . . the children criticize the monitors for the flags they take off. Perhaps as the semester progresses it will work out better. I think this idea was very good." Her reservations were based upon what might be unfair to the child, but her ambivalence--it's a good idea but not working well--was typical of many of the critical statements made by the other student teachers.

Sarah continued in the observer set in the third week. On Thursday of that week, her interest in fairness to the child as she preceived it evoked a lengthy entry, part of which follows. "An unfortunate incident occurred during art. Two boys were sent out of the room while I was helping them tear paper. Allowance wouldn't be made even though the other children were also talking." Now, this event and Sarah's feelings about it should not surprise us particularly since it occurred early in the semester. What followed, however, was different from the other logs. "I felt this was wrong--because these pupils might have been reached through art. . . In fact the boys were quite aggravated and actually justly so--as one of them was trying so hard to improve his conduct. . . I feel that after having talked it over with Miss Schaefer (she feels as I did)--perhaps this wasn't the wisest method." This entry would indicate a reversal in the customary flow of influence in the dyad, if Sarah's perception of the result of her conference with Miss Schaefer were correct. The cooperating teacher would have been accepting the student teacher's criticism of her work! More probably, what this entry indicates is that Sarah broke a cardinal rule of student teaching by openly criticizing her cooperating teacher's actions.

---

[1] Sarah taught in Hebrew school.

Sarah continued in the observer set through the fifth week. She helped frequently with individual pupils, especially doing remedial work. She first expressed concern in her log at not moving into the teaching set on Wednesday of that week, when her college supervisor came to visit. "Miss Griffiths came to visit during our arithmetic lesson which continued some time after she left. Then History, French--and time to go--during this day I felt like a fifth grade pupil. All I did was listen." As was pointed out above,[1] Sarah had been increasingly concerned over the fact that while her peers had begun movement into the teaching set, she had not. This was particularly upsetting, since with her church experience she had expected to be ahead of the other girls. The visit of the college supervisor may have heightened her anxiety.

On Friday of that week her log contains another expression of criticism. "Today we had finger painting. However, I felt much more could have been done. The creativity wasn't best--nor did they do a project themselves entirely. As our art course states The aim of education seems to be lost here."[2] This suggests that Sarah had not yet acquired the mature student teacher's perspective. Instead, she explicitly used what she had learned in her college program as the standard by which she negatively evaluated Miss Schaefer's lesson. Sarah's criticisms continued to appear during the sixth week. "The chart is not working out too well. . . and nothing is done yet about this problem." The fact that Sarah was still, in the sixth week, critical of Miss Schaefer's operation was in itself not too unusual. But the fact that her criticism was an old one was. Normally, the influence flow in the dyad and her experiences in the clasroom tended to change the student teacher's position on a given issue, even when she became critical on different ones.

After school on Monday of that week, she and Miss Schaefer talked about Sarah's teaching a unit. We do not know whether Sarah initiated the discussion, but from the context it seems probable. "We also began talking about the unit of work I was to do. As the weeks have been progressing I find that I get little work unless I do it initially--or if I ask her what I can do. This is frustrating. I try to do as much as possible. Secondly I found she does not want to turn over the class to me until late in the semester for she wants to have all the pertinent material covered." Not only did Sarah feel behind in moving to the teaching set; it seemed likely that she would stay behind. Sarah felt frustrated and was afraid that Miss Schaefer would keep her out of the teaching set for a long time. Nor did additional discussion of a future unit reassure her. On the next day she wrote, ". . . this morning we began to talk about the unit I was to present. . . It will be on machines which I hope I know enough about--when the time comes." Things began to look better to Sarah on Wednesday. Her log for that day contains her customary entries from the observer set. "I am helping one youngster who could not grasp the problems. . . We went on to History and there really wasn't too much for me to do." But in addition she wrote, "I went to look up films for my unit. Miss Schaefer was kind enough to show me how to look them up and record them on the call slip. . . It was great. This is my idea of a practice teacher. I was so thrilled to be kept busy today." Sarah's excitement continued throughout the week. She and Miss Schaefer continued discussion of her unit and she assembled materials for it. At the end of the week as Sarah moved towards (though not yet into) the teaching set, her log displayed the flow of advice characteristic of the other logs and of Sarah's first day. "Suggestions: Screen put around Jack because he looks to one side and talks all the time. Keep a somewhat rigid hand in the beginning and you can make a point in fun later." The characteristic advice concerning classroom control and the student teacher's readiness to accept it is here.

---

[1] P. 38.

[2] Underline hers.

Her first experience in the teaching set involved a relatively large unit on machines. The plunge, which came on Thursday of the seventh week, was perhaps too great. They spent forty-five minutes on machines, apparently the first science taught that year. (Remember, Miss Schaefer was concerned with getting over the "pertinent"[1] material first.) Sarah reported the children were excited by the lesson.

The following Thursday (eighth week) Sarah taught again. In between she continued in the observer set but without criticism. "We began with science today. . ." Sarah wrote of an "avid" discussion by the pupils and of one of the experiments ". . . done by one of our 'problem' pupils. . . perhaps we've found a place where we can reach him." The "we" referred to the dyad and indicates Sarah was beginning to see herself as part of the team. We would expect Sarah to be excited by a "problem" child's success in science, particularly since she had spent most of eight weeks observing and helping with such children. But whether Miss Schaefer shared this is problematical. Sarah's log continued, concerning another experiment that day, ". . . not going so well so we stopped after Miss Schaefer came to disagree with what one youngster said. ." On Wednesday the science unit was continued and some of the boys brought in machines which they had made at home. "Miss Schaefer was wonderful in giving me time. . . however I'm wondering if this might not be too much science in too short a period. However it seems that they are really interested for each morning they ask me if they please may have science." On Thursday she wrote, "We didn't have science today, don't ask me where the time went." The following Monday's reference to science was equally brief, "After the test (Basic Iowa) we had some long overdue experiments. I think the lesson is too long and dragged out." The restrictive time element and Sarah's concern for time were typical. What was different was that Sarah's concern about time in her ninth week was related not to the schedule and other material to be covered, but to pupil interest. What Sarah wrote from this series of experiences is different from what developed in other logs under similar circumstances. Most student teachers learned ways to beat the clock. Instead, Sarah wrote, "I must say that one thing it did illustrate to me was the fact that the students are quite interested in science." Note that the center of Sarah's attention was still pupil interest. Her log gives no evidence of her cutting her lesson to meet the schedule, despite her concern for time. In fact, her conclusion that the pupils desired science suggested her perspective concerning the nature of teaching had not changed to a managerial one.

---

[1] required?

Monday of the tenth week saw the completion of the science unit with a test Sarah had developed which Miss Schaefer had checked over and ". . . thought was very good." From this point on through the tenth and eleventh weeks Sarah continued in the observer set. For a short time one morning in the eleventh week, when Miss Schaefer was in conference, Sarah taught spelling and began a language lesson (which was completed by her cooperating teacher). In a lengthy discussion of her first hour alone and several problems with classroom control she wrote, "It seems that although a majority of the pupils do consider me a teacher they realize Miss Schaefer has the upper hand and feel I teach only science and as David said, 'other junk.' However, slowly they realized. . . I really meant business. As one of the pupils said, 'Say, you're like a regular teacher--now!' . . . Perhaps they feel I'm just a helper. . . This is quite a bit more complicated than Hebrew school. . . perhaps because there's no one else to set the stage and demand their attention and give discipline--orders."

Miss Schaefer and Sarah began to plan additional activities for the teaching set. Sarah's log indicates that Miss Schaefer gave her the typical cooperating teacher's criticism of the first unit and advice for getting over the lesson in time. "She also said that I did very well in the previous unit however I shouldn't let one of the boys focus all the attention and let him continue to argue." This was in the eleventh week. Normally our student teachers uncritically adopted suggestions by this time. Instead, Sarah's log continued, "I agree but I feel it is difficult not to call on a child when his hand is up and he might offer some very valuable information." In addition to writing this reservation in her log, Sarah again forgot her status in the dyad and argued her point of view. "She agreed and also realized that she might do the same." In response to Miss Schaefer's criticism of the time taken by the science unit, Sarah argued the learning value of letting the children do the experiments. The basic difference between the two points of view involved are rooted in the fact that Miss Schaefer had the managerial perspective and Sarah did not. Sarah's point of view consistently reflected what she had been taught in her college program. She maintained this point of view not only in the teaching set but also in the dyad and Sarah thought she had won her point. "She also agreed to this and that I didn't get the children to help the experimentor after the first or second day because there was so much to do."

Some of Miss Schaefer's advice seemed to have taken. In her plan for a reading lesson for that week, Sarah wrote, "Keep questions snappy--no long winded comments--but be patient with slow speaker. Cut off comment if you see that the child understands and has conveyed the idea." But in reporting on how her lesson went the next week she wrote, "I had a little trouble with a pupil who. . . likes to argue. . . I've learned how to ignore some of his questions. . . Miss Schaefer says I should learn how to ignore him. But it's awfully hard when a child has his hand up--but I guess I'll learn." She was in her twelfth week.

Sarah had not developed the managerial perspective of teaching. The schedule and the lesson plan did not appear to her more important than the pupils' demands. She neither learned to modify the lesson to the current performance of the class, nor to cut off discussion. She never reported an instance in which she became angry enough to coerce a pupil. Sarah's log indicates repeatedly that she identified with the pupils rather than with Miss Schaefer. Learning problems rather than teaching problems continue to be central in her log at the end. She persisted in paying attention to individual pupils, especially those low in classroom status or requiring remedial work, rather than to the class.

What Sarah did not know was that in the tenth week Miss Schaefer had suggested to the college supervisor that Sarah should be required to retake student teaching. This led to a series of interviews with the Director of Elementary Student Teaching and her program advisor in which Sarah was "laid out in lavender" as one faculty member put it.[1] Based in part on feedback from Miss Schaefer, who felt she was not relating to the pupils in a "professional" way, Sarah was specifically instructed by her program advisor to push the children away, get tough with them and refuse to listen to any of their problems. She was also instructed to never again disagree with her cooperating teacher and to avoid initiating either to her cooperating teacher or the pupils without prior approval from her cooperating teacher.

Sarah obeyed these orders. In the following week she wrote in her log indicating how she felt about the pattern demanded of her. "I still can't help feeling like the little girl who has to say 'mother may I' for that's the way I have to ask Miss Schaefer." In her last week she wrote, "I honestly believe that one should be conscious of time and what the teacher must cover but by weeding out this and that which doesn't seem important, one can lose a certain perspective." So Sarah did not develop the perspective typical of the experienced student teacher. She did, however, obey orders to act docile regardless of her feelings. Her log indicated she did push the pupils away in the last weeks even though this continued to pain her. She also spent much of her last three weeks in the teaching set without developing the managerial perspective and got through student teaching.

---

[1] Her program advisor was one of the principal investigators on this project. Being called in as Sarah's advisor presented him with a classic role conflict. As a researcher he wanted to do nothing but observe the development of Sarah's case. As her advisor he felt it necessary to try and prevent her expulsion from student teaching. It was too late in the semester to try to move her to another situation. So he advised her on how, as he saw it, to survive in Miss Schaefer's room.

We have treated Sarah's case extensively because it is a deviant case. We believe it to be relatively rare. Particularly at the start of the science unit, there was evidence of the normal student teaching pattern.[1] Miss Schaefer seemed to have never quite acquired the initiative within the dyad. She was, of course, always in control of the room. Much of what did not happen may have resulted from Miss Schaefer's concern to cover the "pertinent" material before turning the class over to Sarah. Probably a major factor in this was the fact that this was Miss Schaefer's first student teacher. In addition, Sarah's college supervisor had never been a supervisor before. It is entirely possible that had either of them been more experienced with student teaching, Sarah might not have been a deviant case. Finally, Sarah's previous experience in Hebrew school was compounded by the fact that many of the pupils in Miss Schaefer's class attended that school, though they were not Sarah's pupils there. This experience had been important to her. She had expected to be ahead of other student teachers because of it and referred to it both in the log and her interviews. It may have predisposed her to being more critical of Miss Schaefer, but the early sections of her log do not suggest this. More probably, the Hebrew school experience created a predisposition to identify more with the pupils whose families she knew, than most student teachers did. She was particularly sympathetic to those children who were in trouble academically or with their teacher. Her extensive remedial work with individual pupils during much of the semester may have reinforced this and made the typical student teacher's changes in perspective difficult for her.

More to the point, this second deviant case came very near to not passing successfully through student teaching. Her cooperating teacher asked that she be made to retake student teaching. But for the intervention of a member of the research team, her final grade in student teaching would have been a D in a program where the mean grade was a B. She was given a grade of B.

Discussion of the Findings

The series of explorations which we undertook in trying to understand the social institution which we call student teaching centered upon the question of what is the function of student teaching for the profession and for the student teacher. Our first hypothesis was that student teaching functions to induct entering members of the teaching population into a teacher subculture.[1] This was not borne out by our findings.[2] More important may be the fact that five of the seven sets of scores which changed significantly were in the opposite direction from what we had predicted.[3] These findings suggest that student teaching does not involve an induction into a teaching subculture. Either the concept of subculture is not useful enough as applied to experienced elementary school teachers, or student teaching does not function as an induction into such a subculture.

---

[1] P. 77. Note also later p. 79.

The findings with respect to anxiety reduction and strengthening self-image as a teacher instead, substantiate our second and third hypothesis.[4] Student teaching may be viewed usefully as having the function of reducing anxiety related to teaching a group or class in the presence of an observer.[5] It also has for the student teacher the function of strengthening her self-image as a teacher.

The analysis of student teacher logs may help us understand these two developments. The major factors related to student teacher anxiety as seen in the logs may be classified as four in nature. There is anxiety in the dyadic set involving expressions of dependency upon the cooperating teacher and uncertainty concerning the cooperating teacher's expectations.[6] Expressions of anxiety appear in the logs when the student teacher's transition from the observer to the teaching set is clearly different from her expectations.[7] Entering a new teaching set and confronting difficulties in the teaching set also furnish a context for statements of anxiety.[8] Finally, the presence of observers other than the cooperating teacher seems to create anxiety.[9]

---

[1] Pp. 12-16.

[2] P. 24.

[3] P. 24.

[4] Pp. 25-28.

[5] Whether the anxiety reduction involves only that anxiety produced by student teaching itself is not revealed by this study and thus remains an important moot question.

[6] See for example pp. 39-40.

[7] Pp. 38, 39.

[8] Note Faye, pp. 62, 64.

[9] Pp. 55, 56.

The student teacher's score of her self-image as a teacher goes up as her anxiety goes down. It would seem that moving into student teaching itself is reflected by a strengthening of her self-image as a teacher. We note the change between the first and second TIA administrations.[1] There was no change between the second and third administrations of the TIA. The most significant change seems to have come about near the second half of student teaching. From the logs, it would seem that this change of self-image is related to perceived success in the teaching set and in handling difficulties in it. It may be that the student teacher's anxiety is related to several elements in student teaching, among which is the teaching set and her experiences in it. The student teacher's image of herself as a teacher, however, seems to be most closely related to the teaching set and success in dealing with the problematic situation which she confronts in it.

The logs may also help us understand the changes in student teachers' attitudes and schema which we found in our exploration of the first hypothesis. We first examined the logs from the point of view of that hypothesis.[2] But we did not find evidence to substantiate our initial point of view. The logs indicate, instead, that the nature of the criticism and the advice given the student teacher by her cooperating teacher is limited to methods which will facilitate the management of the class through the scheduled lessons. Put another way, the dyad's function as a social structure of information flow and influence helps the student teacher cope with the problematic situation she faces in the teaching set.[3] From an outside observer's frame of reference, that problematic situation is produced by the combination of three factors: limited time, the potentially vast universe of learning for pupils and the number of children at different stages of development in a room.[4] The cooperating teacher functions as a model and source of advice to help the student teacher redefine these factors as the schedule, the lessons to be covered and the class. From the student teacher's point of view the problematic situation is, with these redefinitions, produced by the need to get the class through the lessons on schedule.[5] This definition of teaching makes teaching primarily a classroom management activity. The before-after changes in scores on the instruments which we found in relation to our first hypothesis "make sense," if management is what student teachers learn.[6] An increase in the amount of teacher initiation

---

[1] Note Table V, p. 28.

[2] Pp. 19-25.

[3] Pp. 70-73.

[4] Pp. 60-70.

[5] Pp. 70-73.

[6] Table II, p. 24.

(I), resulting in pupil activity (AC) and understanding (CO) in the student teacher's writing would seem to be a logical result of viewing teaching more as management at the end than at the beginning of student teaching. Similarly, a rise in potency on the concept of self (SII) and a drop in potency on the concept of pupil (PII) would fit an increased managerial perception of teaching. Finally, the L.B.D.Q. items of consideration were developed precisely as a measure of group leadership. The rise in the scores based on the adaptation of that instrument (CON) suggests a stronger managerial perspective of teaching.[1]

Finally, the logs indicate that the student teacher deals with the redefined problematic situation behaviorally by modifying the lessons to the current performance level of the class, reducing discussion and questions, and coercing students when necessary in order to move the class through the planned lessons in the schedule. This, the student teacher discovers in the teaching set, works. Her anxiety is reduced and her image of herself as a teacher is stronger.

---

[1] The W score was not included in this discussion. Without validation it would be unnecessarily rash to try and generalize from this. The reader may make his own estimate of the meaning of these items by inspecting the Appendices.

APPENDIX I

(Form Q)

The purpose of this test is to measure your feelings toward certain ideas. There are no right or wrong answers. Be sure you mark every scale. Never put more than one mark on a single scale. Sometimes you may feel that you've had the same item before on the test. This will not be the case. Do not look back and forth through the items. Do not try to remember how you checked similar items earlier in the test. Make each item a separate and independent judgment. Work at fairly high speed through this test. Do not worry or puzzle over individual items. On the other hand, please do not be careless because we want your true feelings.

Read each statement carefully.

Think how you feel about the statement.

Decide whether you strongly agree, agree, are undecided, disagree, or strongly disagree with the statement.

Fill in completely the space below the letter on the answer sheet that most closely describes your feeling about the statement:

A. Strongly agree
B. Agree
C. Undecided
D. Disagree
E. Strongly disagree

Use only the special pencil issued to you. Make no marks on the answer sheet other than in the spaces indicated, and erase completely any answers you wish to change.

Go right on to the following page when you finish a page.

You will have approximately one hour in which to finish this test.

1. **Teaching of specific skills and factual subject matter material are the most important functions of the school.**

2. **The teacher should explain his actions.**

3. **Pupils are naturally stubborn.**

4. **The teacher should insist on good work.**

5. **It is more important in school for children to learn to get along with others than it is for them to gain knowledge.**

6. **A teacher should never lose control of the class.**

7. **Students should not disagree with teachers.**

8. **The nature of an individual's motivation is an important determinant of his rate of learning.**

9. **The teacher should be willing to make some changes.**

10. **Most children are conscientious about their work.**

11. **Before teaching I am confident that I will do well.**

12. **It is important that children be given work which is interesting to them, whether or not it will be valuable to them.**

13. **The system of assigning the most desirable jobs to teachers with the greatest seniority is unfair.**

14. **The ability to maintain good order is the most important quality of a good supervisor.**

15. **Behavior is often strongly influenced by group norms.**

16. **The ability to maintain good order is the most important quality of a teacher.**

17. **The attitudes learned by a student are often the most important result of a lesson or unit.**

18. **Non-achieving pupils should be reminded of the attainments of older brothers and sisters.**

19. **The teacher should be friendly and easy to talk to.**

20. **It is usually the uninteresting and difficult subjects that will do the most good.**

21. **A good teacher will establish a routine and stick to it.**

22. **The teacher should criticize poor work.**

23. **When I think about teaching, I am aware of an uneasy feeling.**

DO NOT STOP--CONTINUE TO NEXT PAGE

24. Teachers who have advanced degrees should be paid more than those with less training but extensive experience.

25. The effects of a student's formal school work may be expected to overshadow the influence of student groups or cliques of which he is a member.

26. The teacher should treat all the members of the class as if they are as good as he is.

27. Children today don't know the value of money.

28. Children should learn to do things cooperatively.

29. Persons who do not conform are a nuisance and should be punished because they tend to interrupt the smooth running of a group.

30. The teacher should see to it that the students work together in an organized way.

CONTINUE ON THE NEXT COLUMN OF THE SCORE SHEET WITH NUMBER 31.

31. Children should be made to study material which is uninteresting to them if it will be valuable later.

32. Really good teachers are born, not made.

33. I usually expect to do poorly in a course.

34. It is just as bad to loaf at an employer's expense as it is to steal from him.

35. Young children nowadays are too frivolous.

36. It is important to plan units with the interests and attitudes of the class in mind.

37. People are more or less dishonest.

38. The teacher should be very strict.

39. Each child should learn to do things which very few others can do.

40. Teaching salaries should be based on training more than experience.

41. In teaching, it is quite essential to cover the material in the course of study.

42. All pupils in a given grade should not have to meet the same requirements.

43. There is really little relationship between a teacher's ability and the extent of his college training.

44. The teacher should use suggestions made by the students.

DO NOT STOP--CONTINUE TO NEXT PAGE

45. Before teaching I often feel that I cannot do well.

46. If pupils are eager, alert and interested in what they are doing they probably like their teacher.

47. If a pupil doesn't understand an assignment it is usually the teacher's fault.

48. It is more important that classwork be informative than that it be enjoyable.

49. Organization of classwork and efficient handling of routine are the most important requisites for effective classroom climate.

50. There is little opportunity today for young people to exercise originality or ingenuity.

51. Students are more or less dishonest.

52. A series of lessons planned together as a unit will be more effective than lessons planned on a day-to-day assignment basis.

53. In assigning children to groups, tests are of less value than whether children follow instructions.

54. The well-groomed teacher will make a better impression on the pupils.

55. The teacher should make the way he feels clear to the class.

56. It is advisable, at least in some subjects, to grade a student on the basis of his own achievement and ability.

57. In the case of disagreement between the teacher and pupil, the teacher always "knows best."

58. Before teaching I am aware of an uneasy feeling.

59. Extensive student participation in unit or lesson planning will reduce the amount of work done by the class.

60. The school system should provide lunches without cost to pupils whose parents are unemployed.

CONTINUE ON THE NEXT COLUMN OF THE SCORE SHEET WITH NUMBER 61

61. The teacher should do personal favors for class members.

62. Children should not expect talking privileges when adults wish to talk.

63. It is more important that children learn to follow instructions than that they learn the subject matter.

64. The pupil's impression of the teacher's personality greatly influences what they learn.

DO NOT STOP--CONTINUE TO NEXT PAGE

65. The teacher should try to have things done the same way every day.

66. People are inherently kind, upright and honest.

67. Teaching of small groups within a class will be more effective than teaching the entire class.

68. Supervisors should not be expected to provide Christmas gifts out of their own pockets for those working under them.

69. Even though I am trained to teach, I expect to do poorly at it.

70. The teacher should keep to himself.

71. If a pupil is caught reading a cheap, sensational magazine, the teacher should immediately take it away from him.

72. Young men need some college training to get along in the world.

73. Lessons and units should be planned on the basis of areas in which the class has weaknesses.

74. Children should be called up by rows to get their wraps so as to prevent traffic jams.

75. A teacher's enthusiasm and experience are less important than what she learns in college courses.

76. Misbehavior is generally the result of a lack of interest and motivation on the part of the students.

77. A certain amount of criticism is good for children. It makes them work harder.

78. As a rule, pupils do not have much use for teachers.

79. Employees who have college degrees should be paid more than those with less training but with extensive experience.

80. The teacher should look out for the good of each student.

81. I am not very concerned with the evaluation of my teaching.

82. Teachers should not be expected to provide Christmas gifts out of their own pockets for their students.

83. The teacher should make sure that the students understand what the teacher is there to do.

84. Misbehavior is generally the fault of the student.

85. Any pupil who cheats will also steal.

DO NOT STOP--CONTINUE TO NEXT PAGE

86. It is not important for people to have original or ingenious ideas.

87. The teacher should make the students feel comfortable when they talk with him.

88. Socio-economic class values are important determinants of behavior.

89. Teachers who like pupils will usually encourage pupil initiation and participation in planning lessons.

90. When I plan to teach, I often feel that I cannot do well.

CONTINUE ON THE NEXT COLUMN OF THE SCORE SHEET WITH NUMBER 91

91. Pupils are naturally lazy when it comes to school work.

92. Acceptance of the student by his classmates is an important factor in his behavior and emotional set.

93. Teachers should not be expected to be popular with pupils.

94. Students who do not conform are a nuisance and should be punished because they tend to interrupt the smooth running class.

95. The teacher should make getting things done on time important.

96. Before being evaluated as a teacher, I tend to worry.

97. The teacher should be easy to understand.

98. Teachers who do not like pupils will usually decide on and plan lessons alone rather than use pupil participation.

99. The teacher should see to it that students are working as hard as they ca

100. Attitudes and cognitive knowledge are always learned within a frame of reference.

101. Teachers who really love children will, with experience, become understanding teachers.

102. A certain amount of failure is good for children. It makes them work harder.

103. Before teaching I worry about the possibility of teaching poorly.

104. The teacher should tell the students which work to do.

105. Individual assignments, tailored to the interests and abilities of the student, should be used in preference to assignments for the class as a whole.

106. The teacher should make a program of the work to be done.

107. The teacher should find time to listen to class members.

DO NOT STOP--CONTINUE TO NEXT PAGE

108. A lesson, or unit, will be effective only if its objectives are carefully thought out and stated in advance.

109. Children today are worse than those of the past generation.

110. It is not important for teachers to have original or ingenious ideas.

111. Before teaching I tend to worry.

112. The teacher should try out his new ideas with the class.

113. Children should learn to be very sociable.

114. The teacher should back up the class members in what they do.

115. A teacher's ability to get along with children is more important than her grades in college courses.

116. The teacher should allow the students to argue with him.

117. The teacher should do little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the class.

118. I. Q. scores are a good indicator of student capabilities.

119. I expect to do poorly when I teach.

120. The ability to maintain good order is the most important quality of a good classroom teacher.

CONTINUE ON THE LAST COLUMN OF THE SCORE SHEET

121. The teacher should do things without talking it over with the class.

122. Children should learn to be very ambitious.

123. The teacher should let the students know what is expected of them.

APPENDIX II

(Form TIA)

Basic Data Sheet

1. Name ______________________________

2. Age ______________

3. Father's Occupation ______________________________

4. College or University attended ______________________________

5. Check the appropriate response in the following:

   a. Male __________ Female __________

   b. Married ______ Unmarried ______

   c. Previous teaching experience: None ____________
   Less than 5 years ____________ 5 or more years ____________

   d. Are you currently enrolled in a college? Yes ____ No____

Your name: ______________________ Date: ______________________

Grade(s) in which you teach: Please circle. K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 HS

The first items are concerned with your estimate as to whether those listed below think of you as a student or as a teacher. Circle your response.

If definitely as a teacher, circle . . . . T
If more as a teacher than as a student, circle . . . . t
If halfway between teacher and student, circle . . . . h
If more as a student than as a teacher, circle . . . . s
If definitely as a student, circle . . . . S

Our purpose is to find out whether you feel that you are treated as a teacher or as a student by the following:

1) The teacher with whom you work	T	t	h	s	S
2) The other teachers where you practice teach	T	t	h	s	S
3) The principal where you practice teach	T	t	h	s	S
4) The pupils in the class(es) you practice teach	T	t	h	s	S
5) The other student teachers you know	T	t	h	s	S
6) The supervisor from your college or university	T	t	h	s	S
At this time, do you think of yourself as a student or teacher?	T	t	h	s	S

We would also like your opinion on the following statements:

If you strongly agree, circle . . . . SA
If you agree, circle . . . . A
If you are undecided, circle . . . . U
If you disagree, circle . . . . D
If you strongly disagree, circle . . . . SD

1) The presence of a prospective employer in the classroom while I was teaching would make me tense.	SA	A	U	D	SD
2) It would make no difference in the way I felt if the principal was observing me teach.	SA	A	U	D	SD
3) I would feel uncertain if I were going to teach a single pupil from my class.	SA	A	U	D	SD
4) I feel more uncertain about my teaching if my college supervisor is observing.	SA	A	U	D	SD
5) I would expect no difficulty if I were to teach my entire class tomorrow.	SA	A	U	D	SD
6) I would prefer to have the regular teacher present while I was teaching.	SA	A	U	D	SD
7) When my principal is present, I will feel more uncertain about my teaching.	SA	A	U	D	SD
8) I would expect no difficulty in teaching a group of pupils from my class.	SA	A	U	D	SD

Form TIA

APPENDIX III

(Form 0)

The purpose of this test is to measure your feelings toward certain people or groups of people by having you judge them against a series of descriptive scales. In taking this test, please make your judgments on the basis of what these mean to you. On each page you will find a group of people or a person to be judged and beneath it a set of scales. You are to rate the group of people or person on each of these scales in order.

Here is how to use these scales:

If you feel that the concept at the top of the page is very closely related to one end of the scale, you should circle the "x" as follows:

Fair [✓ x] x x x x x x Unfair
OR
Fair x x x x x x [✓ x] Unfair

If you feel that the concept is quite closely related to one or the other end of the scale (but not extremely), you should circle the "x" as follows:

Strong x [✓ x] x x x x x Weak
OR
Strong x x x x x [✓ x] x Weak

If the concept seems only slightly related to one side as opposed to the other side (but is not really neutral), then you should circle the "x" as follows:

Active x x [✓ x] x x x x Passive
OR
Active x x x x [✓ x] x x Passive

The direction toward which you check, of course, depends upon which of the two ends of the scale seems most characteristic of the thing you're judging.

If you consider the concept to be neutral on the scale, both sides of the scale equally associated with the group of people or person, or if the scale is completely irrelevant, unrelated, then you should circle the middle "x":

Safe x x x [✓ x] x x x Dangerous

Be sure that you mark every scale. Never put more than one mark on a single scale. Sometimes you may feel that you've had the same item before on the test. This will not be the case, do not look back and forth through the items. Do not try to remember how you checked similar items earlier in the test. Make each item a separate and independent judgment. Work at fairly high speed through this test. Do not worry or puzzle over individual items. It is your first impressions, the immediate "feelings" about the items, that we want. On the other hand, please do not be careless because we want your true impression.

COLLEGE STUDENT

Strong	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	Weak
Disreputable	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	Reputable
Cold	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	Hot
Foolish	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	Wise
Unimportant	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	Important
Lenient	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	Severe
Sharp	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	Blunt
Passive	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	Active
Kind	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	Cruel
Drunk	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	Sober
New	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	Old
Pungent	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	Bland
Beautiful	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	Ugly
Heavy	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	Light
Calm	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	Excitable
Fast	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	Slow
Successful	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	Unsuccessful
Angular	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	Rounded
Hard	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	Soft
False	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	True

APPENDIX IV

(Form TAT)

This is a measure of teachers' schemata, or ways of looking at things as teachers or prospective teachers. There are no right or wrong answers. Use your imagination; be creative if possible.

Do not turn to the next page until you are instructed to do so.

(2)

A. What are the teacher and the student doing?

B. Why does the teacher do this?

C. Why is the student doing this?

D. What will happen?

APPENDIX V

Description of Measures

I. "Q" Questionnaire Form

The "Q" form is comprised of nine sets of items selected as nine different measures. In some cases, sets of items were validated in pilot tests. Previous research by others had indicated that some sets of items comprised non-dimensional scales. Some sets of items were surely no more than quasi-scalar; some sets of items were, for press of time, made up of items which, in the judgment of the investigators, were presumed to measure the phenomenon of interest; that is, they had face validity only. Description of the measures and of their derivation follows:

1. SES (Socio-economic Status).

Items which would measure values or attitudes related to socioeconomic status were drawn from Kahl and Kahl's sources.[1] The resulting "S" scale, made up of fifty-one items, was administered to two groups of high school students: a group of fifty-one students in a high school in a predominantly middle class suburb, and fifty-four students in a St. Louis high school which served a predominantly lower class area. The "S" scale, when items were scored 1-5 on the basis of judgment of those who selected the items, distinguished between the two groups of respondents (p .005). The responses of the two groups of subjects were then pooled, and an analysis was made of responses to each item. Those items which distinguished at or above .1 were selected for the SES scale. Utilizing the data from the high school pupil respondents, the SES scale split-half reliability, .59, was computed.

TABLE A

SES Items

(Score 1 for indicated responses, 0 for others.)

14 E
29 C,D,E
37 D,E
60 D,E
66 C,D,E
68 E
79 C,D,E
102 D,E

---

[1] Joseph A. Kahl, James A. Davis, "A Comparison of Indexes of Socio-Economic Status," American Sociological Review, XX (June 1955) 317-25.

2. CON (Consideration Measure, Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire).

This is made up of items selected after factor analysis as measuring leader behavior leading to group efficiency, that is, to satisfaction for members of the group. For further information, see Stogdill and Coons.[1] The scale, as used here, consisted of fifteen items on a 1-5 scale, A=1.

TABLE B

CON Items

2	44	87	117
99	61	97	121(-)
14	70(-)	107	
19	80	114	
26			

3. IS (Initiating Structure, Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire).

This scale is made up of items selected in an Ohio Personnel Board study. The scale was factor analyzed by the Ohio investigators and found to be non-dimensional. The LBDQ was originally a rating scale, but for this study an expectancy form, developed by Smith and Hudgins[2] was employed. IS and CON items start, "A teacher should. . .". One item which originally appeared in the IS measure was omitted by clerical error. Scores were calculated by assigning values of 1-5, following Stogdill and Coons.

4. A(Q) (Anxiety, Q form).

This anxiety measure was made up of items adapted from Mandler's Manifest Anxiety Measure.[3] It contains those items which Mandler used which could apparently be adapted without gross alteration. Responses were weighted: A 1, B 2, C 3, D 4, E 5, except for items which are loaded obversely. For these, responses were weighted: A 5, B 4, etc.

---

[1] Ralph M. Stogdill, Alvin E. Coons, Leadership Behavior: Its Description and Measurement. Research Monograph 88, Bureau of Business Research, (Columbus: Ohio State University, 1957).

[2] Louis M. Smith, Bryce B. Hudgins, Educational Psychology, (New York: Knopf, 1964), 33-35.

[3] G. Mandler, S. B. Sarason, "A Study of Anxiety and Learning," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1952, 47, 166-173.

TABLE D

A(Q) Items

(Items followed by (-) have obverse loadings.)

11
23
33
45
58
69
81(-)
90
96
103
111
119

---

5. R (Rejection of approved practices).

These twelve items, which in the judgment of the investigators, were related to the rejection of attitudes and opinions which would tend to conflict with the practices necessary for operating the school as a bureaucracy, or with norms or customs of the school, as the investigators estimated they might exist. Items were scored on a 1-5 scale (A 1, unless obviously loaded). Items are listed in Table E.

TABLE E

R Items

(Items followed by (-) scored E 1.)

6
13
21(-)
32
40(-)
46
54(-)
64
75
87
98
101(-)
115
120(-)

---

6. W (Withdrawal).

A series of nineteen items to measure attitudes taught in the methods courses which attempt to produce innovation in teaching were selected from syllabi, notes and tests from methods courses. For item numbers and keying, see Table F.

TABLE F

W Items

8	41(-)	73(-)	100
15	49(-)	76	105
17	52	84(-)	108(-)
25(-)	56	88	118(-)
36	67	92	

7. TV (Teacher Value).

This consisted of seven items, four of which were S items selected in the manner described for SES items, in which the S item dealt with teacher behavior. These appeared in the S scale because they are, according to the usual descriptions of socio-economic values, values related to schools and to teaching. Three of the items were alternate forms of SES items, those items in which it was felt feasible to alter the item to make it apply to teacher. Parallel SES items are shown in parentheses following TV item numbers in Table G. Items were scored in the same manner as SES items.

TABLE G

TV Items

7 C,D,E	43 D,E	80 C,D,E
16 D,E (14)	51 D,E (37)	
24 C,D,E (79)	82 C,D,E	

8. P (Pupil Welfare).

A series of eleven items were selected as being related to modifications of attitudes in the direction of those which might be expected if these attitudes reflected the functional importance of the school as a socializing institution. The items, on inspection, are similar to those of the R series, except that social learning, as it was intended, is more heavily stressed.

TABLE H

P Items

5	38(-)	63	113
21	39(-)	64(-)	122(-)
28	53	74	

9. X-MTAI (Items discarded from preliminary versions of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory).

Fifteen items which had appeared in preliminary forms of the MTAI were discarded by the authors of the MTAI because they produced scores which were correlated with experience.

The MTAI was developed about 1940 to measure the difference in attitude between teachers nominated by administrators as "good" and "bad." Although the items had been constructed originally on the basis of a rationale which involved moralistic judgments and personal liking for pupils, this rationale was set aside early in the process of constructing the MTAI.[1] The test, as it appeared in the first preliminary form, was made up of 400 items; it was said of these items only that responses were related to teacher attitude toward pupil. In addition to being validated with the use of teacher samples nominated by administrators, the test was validated against Leeds' "Like Teacher" measure, which was administered to pupils. Scores on the items were item analyzed, and those which distinguished between those nominated as liking pupils and those nominated as not liking pupils were retained. Those not discriminating were replaced by others in the next form of the test. However, when the test battery of discriminating items were administered to a new validation sample, a slight correlation was found between test scores and experience. According to the MTAI manual, these items were then deleted. Although as far as we could determine there was no printed list of items which tended to discriminate between new and old teachers, it seemed clear that those items which did discriminate between the two samples in the validation test, but which were not included in the final printed form of the MTAI, had been eliminated because they also tended to discriminate between new and old teachers. These items, identified by comparing the preliminary MTAI forms with the printed ones, and selecting the discriminating items which had been deleted, formed the Form Q X-MTAI series. For scoring, chi-square tests were made to determine which responses and which items distinguished between the responses of beginning student teachers and experienced teachers. None did.

---

[1] Robert Callis, "The Efficiency of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory in Predicting Inter-Personal Relations in the Classroom," Journal of Applied Psychology, 37 (1953), 82-85.

TABLE J

X-MTAI Items

3	42	71	94
10	47	78	109
18	57	85	120
35	62	91	

II. TIA (Teacher Identification and Anxiety)

The TIA was made up of two groups of items and one single item. The first group of six items was intended as a measure of the extent to which the student teacher perceived himself as being treated as a teacher. Items were scored T,5; t,4; h,3; s,2; S,1. A correlational analysis (Table K) suggested that item 4, dealing with perception of pupils, was largely unrelated to the other items; the item was therefore not scored.

There was also one single item, "At this time, do you think of yourself as a student or a teacher?" This was scored in the same manner as the items in the preceding Teacher Identification Scale.

TABLE K

Intercorrelation of Teacher Identification Items

Item Number	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	--	.71	.66	.13	.44	.43
2		--	.61	.13	.38	.40
3			--	.01	.31	.39
4				--	.08	-.04
5					--	.64
6						--

The second group, of eight items, was designed to measure anxiety, or "tenseness," concerning the perceptions of peers and superordinates (co-operating teacher, other teachers, student teachers, principal, prospective employer). One of the items initially included, (6), dealt with presence of the co-operating teacher in the room. Another, (3), dealt with the student teacher teaching a single pupil. However, since an inter-correlational analysis, Table L, suggested that these items were substantially unrelated to the others, they were not scored with the others.

The TIA was administered to the entire population at the beginning of student teaching and again at the end of student teaching.

Responses were on a five-point scale: SA (Strongly Agree), A (Agree), U (Undecided), D (Disagree), SD (Strongly Disagree). For items 1,3,4,6,7, SA was scored 5; for the other items, SA was scored 1.

For data gathered before student teaching began, form TIA(E), Teacher Identification and Anxiety, Expectancy, was used on the Washington University sample. The instructions were identical to the TIA instructions. The items were different only in that they were put in future tense rather than in present tense.

TABLE L

TIA Anxiety Item Intercorrelations

Item No.	Item No.							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	--	.55	.09	.53	.20	-.17	.56	.11
2		--	.05	.48	.34	-.14	.64	.29
3			--	.16	-.08	.17	.11	.07
4				--	.17	-.13	.42	.03
5					--	.18	.38	.55
6						--	-.13	.20
7							--	.26
8								--

III. Form O (Osgood, the Semantic Differential).

The description of the development and the rationale of the semantic differential is beyond the scope of this report. For an enlightening brief discussion, the reader is referred to Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum.[1] Very briefly, the semantic differential is a measurement of "connotation" attached to concepts. In Osgood's words, it is:

> . . . (a) a carefully devised *sample of alternative verbal responses* which can be standardized across subjects, (b) these alternatives to be *elicited from* subjects rather than emitted so that encoding fluency is eliminated as a variable, and (c) these alternatives to be *representative* of the various ways in which meanings vary.[2]

According to Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum, "the various ways in which meanings vary" have been determined by the selection of sets of antonyms, and the underlying factors which have appeared when respondents have been asked to make selections of one or another of these antonyms as being more or less closely related to a "concept" which is being judged. Factor analysis of several sets of data from rather large groups of respondents has yielded rather uniformly three major factors, and generally several minor factors.

The first of these major factors, the Factor or Dimension I, the "Evaluative Factor" loads heavily good (*vs.* bad), grateful (*vs.* ungrateful), kind (*vs.* cruel). (For a representative list of antonyms and loadings, the reader is referred to Osgood's "Thesaurus Study."[3]) Dimension I is apparently analogous to variance, or in more general terms, positive or negative affect. In the "Thesaurus Study" it accounted for 38% of the total variance. In other factor analyses it accounted for a similar proportion of the total variance.

Factor or Dimension II, "Potency," loads heavily on hard (*vs.* soft), strong (*vs.* weak), severe (*vs.* lenient), heavy (*vs.* light). As Osgood says,[4] "The common character of potency, or toughness, is apparent in the first terms of these pairs." Unless Dimension II is seen as analogous to, or a measure of, approach avoidance gradient (and this seems dubious), there is no counterpart in affect as generally treated. It seems to us that "potent" is related to "powerful," and may well be an operational measure which approaches something like social status. This hypothesis, however, has not been investigated, as far as we know. Factor II accounted for 16.54% of the variance in the "Thesaurus Study," and for a similar percentage of the total variance in other studies reported by Osgood.

---

[1] Charles E. Osgood, George J. Suci, Percy H. Tannenbaum, *The Measurement of Meaning*, (Champaign, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1957).

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 19.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 44-66.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 63.

Factor III, "Oriented Activity," loads heavily on active (*vs.* passive), excitable (*vs.* calm), hot (*vs.* cold). There is, again, no analogy in affect as conventionally described. The loadings cited do strongly suggest activity, and other items which have subsidiary loadings on this scale are intentional (*vs.* unintentional), meaningful (*vs.* meaningless) and progressive (*vs.* regressive). Factor III accounted for 11.22% of the variance in the "Thesaurus Study."

Other factors or dimensions account for progressively smaller percentages of the variance typically and in the "Thesaurus Study." In Form O, Factor V was represented by one item, new (*vs.* old), to make possible a partial validity check. Other dimensions not utilized were IV, stability; VI, novelty; VII, receptivity.

A "concept" (i.e. Public School Teacher) is rated by the subject on a seven point scale for each pair of antonyms, following the instructions on the cover sheet. Responses for antonyms heavily loaded on each factor, or dimension, are summated. Responses, on scales representing dimensions, Osgood feels, may be treated as falling on a ratio scale.

The semantic differential has the advantage of yielding quantified data. Seeming to lie halfway between conventional attitude measures and projective measures, it appears to be difficult to "fake." There was no opportunity to verify reliability, which Osgood[1] estimates at between .85 and 1. We did note that in one case the correlation of Dimension I scores with another measure (reported in Appendix VI) was .65, and that correlations of subjects' Dimension III scores on the concepts "College Student" and "Self" was .70. None of these, of course, afforded a direct test of the reliability of the semantic differential as we used it, but they suggested a fairly high reliability.

The pairs of antonyms used were:

Dimension I	Dimension II
Reputable - Disreputable	Strong - Weak
Wise - Foolish	Severe - Lenient
Kind - Cruel	Cruel - Kind
Beautiful - Ugly	Ugly - Beautiful

---

[1] Osgood, *et al*, *op. cit.*, p. 127.

Successful - Unsuccessful

True - False

Heavy - Light

Angular - Round

Hard - Soft

Dimension III

Hot - Cold

Important - Unimportant

Sharp - Blunt

Active - Passive

Pungent - Bland

Excitable - Calm

Fast - Slow

Successful - Unsuccessful

Dimension V

New - Old

The scoring of some pairs in two dimension introduced some correlations between the measures, but was felt to be justifiable in view of the additional reliability which would probably be gained. Responses were scored from 3 to -3. The first antonym given in each case above was at the high end of the scale; scoring followed Osgood's method.

Subjects were asked to rate the following concepts: "College Student," "Public School Teacher," "Pupil," "Myself."

IV. TAT (Thematic Apperception Test).

For a general bibliography of applications of a similar TAT measure, see Atkinson;[1] for a description of "Schema" see McClelland.[2] The test as given was in the form used by McClelland: there were four pictures, and respondents were asked to write stories concerning each on the response form (Appendix IV). Instructions were McClelland's, except that it was specified that the situation concerned pupils and teachers. The instructions, read at the beginning of the TAT presentation, were:

---

[1] J. W. Atkinson, G. H. Litwin, "Achievement Motive and Test Anxiety Conceived as Motive to Approach Success and Motive to Avoid Failure," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1960, 60, 52-63.

[2] D. C. McClelland, J. W. Atkinson, R. A. Clark, E. L. Lowell, The Achievement Motive, (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1953).

> You are going to see a series of pictures of teachers and students, and your task is to tell a story that is suggested to you by each picture. Try to imagine what is going on in each picture. Then tell what the situation is, what led up to it, what the teacher and student are thinking, and what they will do.
>
> In other words, write as complete a story as you can--a story with plot and characters.
>
> You will have twenty seconds to look at the picture and then four minutes to write your story about it. Write your first impression and work rapidly. I will keep the time and tell you when it is time to finish your story and get ready for the next picture.
>
> There are no right or wrong stories or kinds of pictures, so you may feel free to write whatever is suggested to you when you look at the picture. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are not important. What is important is to write out as fully and as quickly as possible the story that comes to your mind as you imagine what goes on in the picture. Notice that there is one page for writing each story. If you need more space for writing any story, use the reverse side of the paper.

Stories were scored for four categories. The first category (J) was the use of professional terms. It was hypothesized that a high frequency of usage of professional terms would occur during student teaching, and that these terms, as affording available concepts for categorizing and analyzing student behavior, would affect teacher behavior. A list of terms categorized as "professional terminology," or "Pedaguese," follows. Frequently the decision to score or not to score was made depending on the context, as comparison of lists of terms scored and terms not scored will indicate.

achieve

achievement

activity period

activity (group-, play-, etc.)

adjustment

adult approval

aids

authoritarian

chalkboard (but not blackboard)

class discussion (also group discussion, etc.)

classroom situation

counselor (in a school sense)

conference (in a school sense)

creative activity (also creative thinking, etc.)

curriculum

deductive reasoning

developing a concept

evaluation

experience (an-, learning-, life-)

evaluation

field trip

free play

frustrated

goals (teacher's, class, etc.)

guidance

incentive

individual difference

insight

interaction

leader-follower

learn to work with (new materials, etc.)

lecturing

meaningful

monitor

motivate

observed behavior

organized program

peer, or peer group

perception

permissive

physical education

proctoring

project

rapport

receptive attitude

research tool

responses

sharing expenses

scale

school safety

show and tell

situation (life-, test-, school-, etc.)

skills (learning-, reading-, teaching-, etc.)

stimuli

study habit

subject matter field

symbol

tool (related to teaching or learning)

traumatic

visual demonstration

visual reality

warmth (sense of teacher emitting)

The following, although sometimes used in a technological sense, were not scored, on the grounds that they also appeared in non-technological language. (The decision as to including or excluding given words or phrases is not critical; for reliability, it is only essential that there be a decision.)

activity

attitude

concept

discipline

discussion

environment

experience

health

helper

goals

materials

project

recess

safety

share or sharing (in the sense of something material)

stimulate, stimulated

subject matter

symbols

Neither of these lists, of course, is complete. Some few terms were clearly technological, and were scored. Many other words and terms, of course, were clearly non-technical, and not scored.

The second category (INT) was designed to supply information on frequency with which teacher was seen as initiating or controlling pupil behavior; professional behavior logically must be contingent on client behavior, rather than the reverse. This category was labelled "teacher initiation and control." Here scoring was for teacher indication, pupil response; teacher assigns work, pupil performs work; teacher lectures, pupil listens; teacher directs, pupil complies. Situations in which the pupil was perceived as initiating, even though the teacher directed afterwards, were not scored. For teacher control, the idea of the teacher holding power and setting conditions by ruling out behavior or allowing and giving priority to other behaviors was scored. Teacher control is present only when one or a very limited number of responses is open to the pupil. Examples:

> One student is acting as an instructor to another student under the apparent supervision of the teacher.
>
> The teacher has probably sent him to do this.
>
> Johnnie isn't getting his work done so the teacher will remind him to get busy when she notices he isn't doing anything.

The purpose of scoring for the third category (ACT) was to obtain an indication of the perception of teacher as a "first line supervisor" or foreman. This, it was felt, was related to maintenance of the organization. It could be argued that this was scoring for a certain kind of schema, or, non-theoretically, in the terms of Berelson,[1] that the way a prospective teacher or teacher describes a situation is the way he sees it.

Three subcategories were employed. (Sub-categorization seemed a defensible compromise which would allow "richness" or breadth of category, with reliability in scoring.) The first of these was "Keeping workers busy." Examples:

> Johnny is not getting his work done so the teacher will remind him to get busy when she notices he isn't doing anything.
>
> The teacher will probably admonish the non-participant and he will be forced to join the group activity.
>
> The student is completely distracted from his lesson and is concentrating on another interest. The teacher will call upon him because she knows his attention has been diverted, and she wants him to be alert.

The second sub-category was one in which students were seen as material to be prepared for some later stage of the organization's flow of work. Examples:

> Other experiences will be told by the rest of the children.
>
> The pictures will draw out the child's own ideas and give them [sic] an opportunity to participate.

The third sub-category was "teacher as first line supervisor." Pupils were seen as workers for whom the teacher, as first line supervisor, or foreman, lays out work to be done without reference to a purpose outside the school's. Examples:

> The teacher will ask the next child what his impressions are, and so on around the circle.
>
> The teacher will say something to hurry them up and they will join the rest of the class.

---

[1] B. Berelson, Content Analysis in Communications Research, (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1952).

> She has the class follow along as she reads aloud because they might start thinking of other things if they were allowed to sit and listen.

The story about each of the four pictures was scored for presence of imagery of the sub-categories, and these were totaled for each subject's AC score.

The fourth category (CO) was cognition. It served as an indicator of pupil understanding resulting from teacher initiation or teacher activity perceived as steps leading toward understanding, as when mastery of a concept or improved learning was seen as the result or consequence of the story. Examples:

> Progress reports help both the student and the teacher to realize what has been learned and what has not been learned.

> To prepare the class for reading by stimulating desire to appreciate word symbols for later reading activities.

> She does this so that each student will be able to improve the next picture he or she draws.

> She calls him in to help him get started right and to get better grades on his next card.

The four categories were scored at the page level. Thus, a particular subject was scored 0 or 1 on each category for each of his four stories. The theoretical range on any of the four categories per subject was, therefore, 0 to 4 on each administration of the TAT. A minimum of 80% agreement between two independent scores was reached on each category per subject and page.

APPENDIX VI

Correlates of the MTAI Validation Instrument

In education literature there has been frequent manifestation of concern for teacher attitude or affect toward pupils. One general ground for this concern has been that teaching effectiveness, as variously defined, is related to teacher attitude or affect. One widely used measure for such attitudes is the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory.

The MTAI was validated against principals' judgments of teacher attitude toward pupils, observer rating, and against "My Teacher," a measure presumably of pupil attitude toward teacher (Leeds). The validity of the MTAI is argued in large part on the basis of correlations, .452 (Leeds) and .49 (Callis) between teacher MTAI scores and their pupils' scores on "My Teacher." The observed correlation is evidence for the validity of the MTAI if the hypothesis is true. This hypothesis (which may well have accounted for concern with teacher affect), was ". . . If we could measure the attitudes of both teachers and pupils, there would be a high correlation between them" (Cook and Leeds, p. 399), that is, that pupil-teacher and teacher-pupil affect are interdependent.

The hypothesis as it stood seemed reasonable. On further consideration, however, it appeared that behavior was an intervening variable. Taking this into account, the hypothesis, paraphrased, would then become: affect of pupil toward teacher is related to teacher behavior which is in turn related to teacher affect toward pupil. Since the cogent aspect of teacher behavior is the aspect perceived by the pupil, it appeared appropriate to stipulate that pupil's perception was also an intervening variable. With this taken into account, the hypothesis would take this form: affect of pupil toward teacher is related to pupil perception of teacher, which is in turn related to teacher behavior; teacher behavior is related to teacher affect toward pupils. With instruments now available, the relationships postulated are subject to test, and in the process the nature of the MTAI validating measure, "My Teacher," and the MTAI itself may be somewhat clarified.

First, we were interested in the degree to which "My Teacher" was a measure of pupil affect, and the degree to which it was a measure of pupil perception. As a measure of perception, a modification of the LBDQ "Consideration" scale (Stogdill), which was developed as a measure of group member's perception of leader behavior was employed. The Semantic Differential Dimension I (Osgood, et al) was selected as a measure of pupil affect. The Semantic Differential instrument was constructed by selecting twelve pairs of Osgood's antonyms heavily loaded on Factor I, and placing them in Osgood's format with buffer items, and asking the pupils to rate the concept "My Teacher". Instructions to the respondents were Osgood's, slightly modified.

These instruments, with "My Teacher," were administered to the pupils of each of two social studies teachers in a suburban junior high school. Pupils were directed to rate the teacher on each instrument. The responses concerning each of the teachers were treated separately; essentially this was experiment and replication. Our hypothesis led us to predict that the correlation of "My Teacher" with LBDQ "Consideration" would be greater than with the Semantic Dimension I if "My Teacher" was primarily dependent upon pupil perception. We predicted also that "My Teacher" would correlate positively with the Semantic Differential, but that the correlation of "My Teacher" and LBDQ "Consideration," with the Semantic Differential Dimension I partialed out, would be greater than the correlation of "My Teacher" and Semantic Differential Dimension I, LBDQ partialed out.

TABLE I

Correlation of "My Teacher," MTAI validating instrument

	N 117	N 142
r_{12}	.71	.65
r_{13}	.65	.43
r_{23}	.68	.50
$r_{12.3}$	.48	.56
$r_{13.2}$	.25	.16

1: Leeds' "My Teacher"

2: LBDQ "Consideration"

3: Semantic Differential

The correlations and differences in correlations generally supported the predictions. All the correlations were significantly different from zero. The differences between partial correlations were in the predicted direction. For the samples, the correlations and the differences between them were significant at .001, except for the differences between "My Teacher" vs. LBDQ "Consideration" and "My Teacher" vs. Semantic Differential in the first case. There was some evidence, then, that "My Teacher" measured both affect and perception, but primarily the latter.

The relationship of teacher affect toward pupil and teacher perception of appropriate behavior toward pupil was also investigated. The general hypothesis above would lead to the prediction that the relationship between these would be high. If, then, teacher behavior toward pupil was highly dependent upon teacher affect toward pupil, LBDQ "Consideration" scores of teachers, reflecting teacher perception of appropriate behavior toward pupil and Semantic Differential Dimension I scores, a measure of affect when "pupil" was rated, would be highly correlated; if teacher behavior toward pupil was dependent upon other teacher attributes, the correlation would be low. That teacher behavior toward pupil is not always primarily a product of teacher affect toward pupil seemed a definite possibility. An alternative which seemed to us to have some tentative value in explaining behavior toward pupil was that teacher behavior toward pupil would be determined not primarily by teacher affect toward pupil, but by teacher perceptions of teacher role.

LBDQ "Consideration" scores were obtained on an expectation form of the test ("A teacher should. . ."), the items of which were mixed at random with items of similar form from other measures. Dimension I scores on the concept "pupil" were gathered at the same time. Scores were obtained from two groups of subjects. For the first, made up of sixty-four female elementary school student teachers, *r* was .00. For the second, made up of ninety-nine female elementary school teachers, *r* was .13. Perhaps, then, whatever causes a teacher to act in a "considerate" manner is not positive affect toward pupil, and the correlation of MTAI and "My Teacher" was not accounted for by their relationship as measures in terms of reciprocal affect.

Returning to the modified hypothesis as it relates to the MTAI, alterations seem in order. It is not clear that MTAI is related to pupil affect; there is even a possibility that the correlation between "My Teacher" and MTAI results only from agreement of teacher and pupil perception of teacher behavior. It is not clear that teacher behavior toward pupil is related to teacher affect toward pupil. Therefore, the hypothesis might in part be: pupil's perception of teacher is related to teacher behavior; teacher's behavior toward pupil is determined by perception of teacher role or other teacher attributes. There are, of course, untested relationships remaining, including those of pupil perception and teacher behavior. Nonetheless, the revised hypothesis does seem to suggest further research which will clarify the interrelationship of teacher-pupil and pupil-teacher affect.

Summary

It is suggested that an instrument against which the MTAI was validated is not primarily a measure of pupil affect toward teacher, but a measure of pupil perception of teacher. The lack of relationship between a measure of teacher affect toward pupil also suggests than an hypothesis of simple reciprocity of pupil-teacher affect may be inadequate, and that the MTAI may be a measure of teacher attribute other than affect toward pupil.

NOTE: This research was supported in part by funds of the U. S. Office of Education Cooperative Research Branch.

APPENDIX VII

Alice's Balance Sheet

Lessons I've Learned

surprised What I was horrified at:	learned What I do:
1. Her shaking John (I was horrified)	I shook John once before becau you must do something at the moment and later talk to the offender.
2. Having the children help with duties, etc. (Move chairs and tables for pre-school, wash paint jars out, take notes to other teachers, bring kleenex to you, water plants, help clean out bird cages, etc.)	It is only natural to have the children help--they learn to b responsible and that nice thin need care, and how much caring for things need!
3. Making Jim and Janie stay resting on floor during story time, since they talked during nap time.	They need to be taught that there is a right place and time for everything!
4. Make sure everyone has all wraps on when going outside or home (all zippers done, all buttons done).	They'll catch cold--and you'll catch heck from home!
5. Close all windows--I let a draft in one day--during nap time.	Close all windows during naps.
6. New teacher sitting down while on playground--only looking one way.	To stand up and look each way on playground.
7. The children were quite excited and noisy and rambunctious one day when I played rhythms (too fast).	To play softly and slowly for rhythms, esp. skipping, hoppi galloping.
8. Miss A. told me that I also had the tendency to talk to the children too long and too much.	Don't reprove vocally every ti a disapproving look or a shake the head in an east-west direction and frowning works better! (It does!)

9.	A new teacher taught 11-23 with very sore throat and 101° F. temperature--and laughed about it.	Never come to school feeling sick because: 1. You expose the children. 2. You make matters worse wi you.
10.	Miss Adams puts very few chords with the lead note when playing for the children to sing, letting them hear the correct note on which to sing. I always put lots of chords in to "sound good"!	The children can't hear their note with chords interrupting You can hear their words bett and tones when you aren't con cerned with thinking about an listening to yourself. (It's easier for you, also.)
11.	Those children talking and creating a fuss during the singing or story time, she asked to move over to where she points because she "can't see them where they were."	They would get mad and talk m possibly if she simply bawled them out. They are pleased that she wants her to see them Good psych.
12.	If a child is not singing during the group singing time, she asks them to please come up by the piano and help her sing.	They probably do not know the songs very well and are bored. They will learn the songs bet and forget the disturbance wh close to the piano.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Callis, Robert, "The Efficiency of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory in Predicting Interpersonal Relations in the Classroom," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 37 (1953), 82-85.

Cook, Walter W., Leeds, Carroll H., *Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory*. New York, Psychological Corporation, 1951.

Leeds, Carroll H., "The Construction and Differential Value of a Scale for Determining Teacher-Pupil Attitudes," Doctoral Dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1947.

Osgood, Charles E., Suci, George J., Tannenbaum, Percy H., *The Measurement of Meaning*. Champaign, Illinois, University of Illinois Press, 1957.

Stogdill, Ralph Melvin, Coons, Alvin E., *Leadership Behavior: Its Description and Measurement*. Research Monograph 88, Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University, Columbus, 1957.